

THE
QUARTERLY
REVIEW

VOL. 256.

COMPRISING Nos. 507, 508

PUBLISHED IN
JANUARY & APRIL, 1931.

LONDON:

JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET, W.1.

NEW YORK:

LEONARD SCOTT PUBLICATION COMPANY

1931

What will be Your Income When you retire?

You will wish to live as comfortably as you did during your working days.

But no man expects to receive a pension equal to his salary. Would it not be wise, therefore, to secure an income sufficient to make up the difference between salary and pension?

For a yearly outlay well within the means of middle-class people you can ensure a

Guaranteed Income *of say* **£300 A YEAR** at age 60.

Should you die before the income becomes payable a substantial sum, with guaranteed Bonus additions, would be available for your dependants.

If you would like a Guaranteed Income of £300 a year at 60 or earlier, fill in and forward this coupon.

TO THE PRUDENTIAL ASSURANCE CO. LTD.
Holborn Bars, London, E.C.1.

Please send me particulars of an Endowment Assurance Policy with Guaranteed £3 per cent. Bonus which will enable me to secure an income of £.....at age.....

My age next Birthday is.....

NAME
(Mr., Mrs. or Miss)

ADDRESS
Q.4.31.

P.P.216

CONTENTS

OF

No. 507.—JANUARY, 1931.

ART.	PAGE
1. QUEEN VICTORIA. By John Bailey	1
2. THE RETREAT OF 1914 AND THE BATTLE OF THE MARNE. By Major-General Sir Frederick Maurice, K.C.M.G.	22
3. OXFORD—CAMBRIDGE; CAMBRIDGE—OXFORD. By Claud E. Benson	40
4. EDUCATION AND THE FILM. By the Lord Gorell	51
5. THE ROYAL DUBLIN SOCIETY AND ITS BICENTENARY. By J. M. Hone	63
6. RUSSIA AND THE FIVE YEARS' PLAN. By Brig.-General W. H. H. Waters, C.M.G.	78
7. ROGER ASCHAM. By the Rt Rev. the Bishop of Goulburn, New South Wales	96
8. THE DAWN OF MODERN FARMING	111
9. ST KILDA, PAST AND PRESENT. By Alasdair Alpin MacGregor	132
10. THE FUTURE OF AUSTRIA. By Robert Dunlop	150
11. THE MEANING OF MONASTICISM. By G. G. Coulton, D.Litt.	159
12. R 101 AND AFTERWARDS	178
SOME RECENT BOOKS	192

Mr. Wister's Roosevelt—'Illusion' and 'The Fourth Seal'—Dr Gore's Gifford Lectures—Publishing and Bookselling—Penn and Erasmus Darwin—The Apostate—Tamburlaine—Blake and Chatterton—Improving on Shakespeare—The Civil Service—The Ladies of Llangollen—Victorian Architecture—Tudor England—Mr. Courtneidge's Reminiscences—Two Memoirs—John Freeman.

CONTENTS

No. 505.—JULY, 1930.


ART.	PAGE
1. The Freedom of England	1
2. The Curse of Trial by Jury	17
3. The Archduke Franz Ferdinand	29
4. The New Era of Liquid Fuel	44
5. The Question of Stag-Hunting	63
6. English and the Need of an Academy	76
7. Man's Soul in War	94
8. Death Duties or Life Duties?	108
9. Some Forgotten Writings of Walter Scott	116
10. The Japanese Second Chamber	133
11. The Passing of the Private Palace	145
12. The School of English Church Music	158
13. The Wisdom of the East	164
14. The Position of the Conservative Party	179
Some Recent Books	197

No. 506.—OCTOBER, 1930.

1. Insurance or the Dole	211
2. Christopher Marlowe, the Man	231
3. The Music of Life	247
4. The Report of the Indian Statutory Commission and its Critics	260
5. The Jesuits	281
6. The Call to Efficiency	294
7. The Stage: Yesterday, To-day, and To-morrow	315
8. 'The Soviet Union and Peace'	331
9. A Painter of Ferrara	347
10. 'Malbrook'	360
11. The Evolution of Sex	369
Some Recent Books	398

GENERAL INDEX TO THE QUARTERLY REVIEW.

No. 482, forming Vol. 243, and containing a General Index to Volumes 223-242 inclusive, is published.

 The QUARTERLY REVIEW is published on or about the 15th of January, April, July, and October.

Price Thirty-two Shillings per Annum, *post free*.

CONTENTS

OF

No. 508.—APRIL, 1931.

ART.	PAGE
1. THE DECLINE AND FALL OF SOCIALISM. By W. A. Hirst - - - - -	205
2. PERJURY. By Claud Mullins - - - - -	223
3. SEA MONSTERS. By C. R. Haines - - - - -	236
4. THE REAL JOAN OF ARC - - - - -	249
5. THE MANDATES SYSTEM: ITS FIRST DECADE. By Sir Alexander Wood Renton, K.C.M.G. - - - - -	261
6. EDWARD FITZGERALD. By Horace G. Hutchinson - - - - -	279
7. CONCERNING THE WOODCOCK. By Douglas Gordon - - - - -	302
8. FRENCH PRIVATEERS AND SCOTTISH JACOBITES. By W. Branch Johnson - - - - -	315
9. THE INTERNATIONAL FISHERY INVESTIGATIONS. By J. Travis Jenkins, D.Sc. - - - - -	332
10. SOLDIERS' SLANG. By Eric Partridge - - - - -	347
11. STRAFFORD. Sir John Marriott - - - - -	360
12. THE FORESTRY COMMISSION IN GREAT BRITAIN. By E. P. Stebbing - - - - -	377
13. MAHATMA GANDHI. By E. M. E. Blyth - - - - -	388
SOME RECENT BOOKS - - - - -	402

An Elizabethan Journal—The Early Russells—'Account Rendered'—London Government—The Emperor Karl—French and Chilean Histories—Nansen—A Mecca Pilgrimage—Mr Shan Bullock—The Suffragettes—The Barrier Reef—'Anglic'—The Greek Mind—'R. L. S.,' Blake, and Christina Rossetti—The Shepherd's Calendar—Boccaccio—Mr Stoll's Essays—Lullabies and Fiction.

CONTENTS

No. 506.—OCTOBER, 1930.

ART.	PAGE
1. Insurance or the Dole	211
2. Christopher Marlowe, the Man	231
3. The Music of Life	247
4. The Report of the Indian Statutory Commission and its Critics	260
5. The Jesuits	281
6. The Call to Efficiency	294
7. The Stage: Yesterday, To-day, and To-morrow	315
8. 'The Soviet Union and Peace'	331
9. A Painter of Ferrara	347
10. 'Malbrook'	360
11. The Evolution of Sex	369
Some Recent Books	398

No. 507.—JANUARY, 1931.

1. Queen Victoria	1
2. The Retreat of 1914 and the Battle of the Marne	22
3. Oxford—Cambridge; Cambridge—Oxford	40
4. Education and the Film	51
5. The Royal Dublin Society and its Bicentenary	63
6. Russia and the Five Years' Plan	78
7. Roger Ascham	96
8. The Dawn of Modern Farming	111
9. St Kilda, Past and Present	132
10. The Future of Austria	150
11. The Meaning of Monasticism	159
12. R 101 and Afterwards	178
Some Recent Books	192

GENERAL INDEX TO THE QUARTERLY REVIEW.

No. 482, forming Vol. 243, and containing a General Index to Volumes 223-242 inclusive, is published.

The QUARTERLY REVIEW is published on or about the 15th of January, April, July, and October.

Price Thirty-two Shillings per Annum, *post free*.

538
#75

THE
QUARTERLY REVIEW

No. 507.—JANUARY 1931.

Art. 1.—QUEEN VICTORIA.

The Letters of Queen Victoria (Third Series). Published by Authority of His Majesty the King. Edited by George Earle Buckle. In Three Volumes. Vol. I, 1886–1890. Murray, 1930.

WE talk of the Elizabethan Age and the Age of Anne. And we have always known that Elizabeth, though her reign was so fertile in men of a genius to which she had no pretensions, was yet perhaps more representative of the England of her reign than Cecil or Raleigh or even Shakespeare. And Mr Trevelyan has just been teaching us that, whoever was wrong about the public feeling of the English people in the first years of the eighteenth century, Anne, who used to be thought so stupid, was, as the General Elections showed, always right. So there were in the Victorian Age many people of more genius and originality than the Queen. But it would not be easy to find any figure more representative. It is her age. She partly reflected it and partly created it. The moral and social reaction from the indecencies of the Regency period to the decorum of her own was only in part a reaction. It was, largely, the direct result of the Queen's example and influence. Her 'I will be good' was spoken in a bad world and had much to do with making a better one. And so in many other matters she half reflected and half stimulated the thoughts and feelings of her time. Neither she nor nine-tenths of the many thousands who bought the poems of Tennyson had any perception at all of the incomparable verbal art of Tennyson or any more understanding of his deeper thought than the fools

Vol. 256.—No. 507.

who to-day suppose themselves clever enough to look down upon it. But she and her people found in Tennyson just what they wanted : an utterance in verse of what they had in themselves ; their facile emotion, tending towards sentimentality, their grave sense of duty, their strong religious convictions, disturbed but not destroyed by doubts, their rather naïve trust in all that the new science and the new industry and commerce were to do for the world, and their faith, always increasing as the reign advanced, in England and her world-wide mission : a faith which no one held more strongly than the Laureate and the Queen. In all these matters, and especially in the simplicity and domesticity of the Victorians, and their conviction that the English people were very superior to foreigners and always in the right in international disputes, not one of her Prime Ministers was so Victorian as Victoria herself.

So we see her age in her, as we see her in these frank unguarded letters where her weaknesses as well as her strength are revealed to us without concealment or reserve. The five years which this new volume covers were among the most critical in her reign. We see her at the beginning of 1886 dreading, resisting, passionately protesting against the return to office of Gladstone, now committed to the new and abominable doctrine of Home Rule. She has to accept the inevitable, but, to her great and unconcealed rejoicing, it lasts only a few months, and for the rest of her life, though she had yet once more for a year or two to accept Gladstone as her Prime Minister, he was by that time really powerless ; and for the rest of her life she saw her country living in peace, prosperity, and Imperialism, and lived herself in a kind of anticipated apotheosis.

There are six chapters in this new volume, which embraces the five years from the beginning of 1886 to the end of 1890. The correspondence deals with all sorts of subjects, and the small matters sometimes illustrate the character of the Queen even better than the great. Every one who is interested either in the Queen or her time will feel renewed gratitude to Mr Buckle for labours which must have been enormous and a judgment which seems very rarely to fail. His material comes from many pens beside the Queen's : Sovereigns, Ministers, Bishops, Soldiers, all make their contributions. In particular the

Emperor William has given his consent to the inclusion of some of his letters. There is also a letter from Bismarck. The letters from English statesmen are, of course, particularly numerous; the reports by Gladstone, Randolph Churchill and W. H. Smith, of debates in the House of Commons, giving first-hand pictures by first-rate authorities of the successes and failures of Parliamentarians; the letters of Gladstone giving at great length defences of his policy and actions; those from Salisbury and Rosebery dealing mainly with foreign affairs, exhibiting the new continuity which owed so much to the Queen, and incidentally paying tribute to the help afforded by her experience and great position in Europe. Mr Buckle's own introductions to each chapter are brief and impartial: he is only concerned to put the reader in possession of the circumstances in which the letters were written. The notes are useful but not numerous. There are a few illustrations. Altogether Mr Buckle is to be warmly congratulated on maintaining—he could not surpass—the high level of his previous volumes.

Of course most of the letters he has selected from his vast material have been chosen as dealing with matters big enough to concern the historian. There are three things which stand out above all. The first is Gladstone's conversion to Home Rule, followed by the resistance of the Liberals who formed the Liberal Unionist party and brought about his defeat in the House of Commons and, later, in the country. The second is the brief but exciting story of Alexander of Bulgaria, a prince, a victorious general, a kidnapped victim, a prince again, restored and acclaimed but soon forced to abdicate, a princess's suitor, accepted by her and her parents, and then once more rejected by political intrigue and forced to exchange his hopes of a place on the map of Europe as a Queen's grandson and an Emperor's brother-in-law for privacy, obscurity, and an actress-wife. The third great matter is the illness and death of the Emperor Frederick and the strained relations which it caused between the Emperor William and the English Court. Other things which occupy less space but are of interest both in themselves and as exhibiting the constant and animated activities of the Queen, are her Jubilee in 1887; the resignation of Lord Randolph Churchill and the appointment in his place of Goschen, with whom the

Queen is shown in intimate correspondence a year before he took office ; the attempt, fiercely and successfully resisted by the Queen, to abolish the office of Commander-in-Chief ; the appointment of Bishops, in which she plays an active part and shows herself wiser than her Prime Minister ; and the dispute about the provision of incomes for her grandchildren, finally settled by the loyal assistance of Gladstone.

Of course a hundred other topics come in ; but these are enough to show the variety and importance of the book. The pleasure of such letters and journals is that they take us behind the greatest scenes of the years in which they were written. What we get is what the Queen and Salisbury thought and felt at the moment about the great events then occurring ; and what some others, notably Bismarck, found it politic to pretend to feel and think, which, as the pretence can no longer deceive us, gives us now the very truth which it was meant to conceal. But neither Salisbury nor Bismarck are the primary business of the book : that is, of course, the Queen. Its first interest is the further revelation of what she really was and did. To her subjects at the time she was an almost unseen object of veneration. Here she is a woman and a mother, a friend and an enemy, as well as a Queen ; and we see her, not as she appeared in her stately official actions and utterances, but as she instantly reacts to every event that occurs, to every letter she receives : eagerly, angrily, passionately pleading and insisting, commanding and rebuking, always sure of her own views, and unreserved about her own feelings, often scornfully indignant with those who could not share her feelings or accept her opinions.

All this often raises an important constitutional point. The Whigs have always asserted that it was the Sovereign's duty not only to accept Ministers agreeable to the majority of the House of Commons, however unwelcome to himself, but to refrain from opposing their policy. The Queen did the first ; often, as in 1880 and 1886, with unconcealed reluctance : but she did it. She could not help doing it : there was no choice. But, as we see here, more even than in the earlier volumes, she made no pretence of doing the second. Most historians—but it is to be remembered that historians have mostly been Whigs—

have condemned as unconstitutional the action of George III in inducing the House of Lords to reject Fox's East India Bill and so to deliver him of a Ministry he detested. If George III was a constitutional criminal, it is difficult to see how it can be denied that Victoria was one also. Here is no concealment that before and during Gladstone's brief term of office in 1886, the Queen was doing everything she could, first to form a majority that could keep him out and then to collect one that could defeat and expel him. She had written to Goschen, as the previous volume shows, before the end of 1885, strongly urging him to save her and the country from Gladstone: 'I appeal to *you* and to all moderate loyal and *really patriotic* men, who have the safety and well-being of the Empire and the Throne at heart, and who wish to save them from destruction, with which, if the Government again fell into the reckless hands of Mr Gladstone, they would be threatened, to rise above party and to be true patriots. . . . Let me urge and implore you . . . to do all you can to gather around you the moderate Liberals to prevent Mr Gladstone,' etc., etc.; 'you *must* act or the country will be ruined.' And when the Conservative Ministry was defeated she again, we see here, turned at once to Goschen and urged him to form such a body of Liberal Opposition to Gladstone as would make it impossible for him to take office. Lord Salisbury, evidently fearing she might expose herself to attack, offered to advise her seeing Goschen so as to cover her. Goschen, however, felt his going to Osborne might do her harm, and wrote advising her to send for Gladstone, which she did through Sir Henry Ponsonby, who was commanded, while inviting him to form a Ministry, to say that the Queen 'had understood from his repeated expressions of a desire to retire from public life, that he would not accept office.' But this sarcasm had no more effect than the kindly irony of what she had written to Mrs Gladstone a few weeks before: 'You must rejoice at Mr Gladstone's rest—which he so *often* spoke of as his *great* wish and which is essential at his time of life, when overwork and excitement are always detrimental to health.' Gladstone gravely thanked Her Majesty for 'her gracious consideration for his declining years'; but he at once told Ponsonby he would accept office. What

is important to notice, however, is that his becoming her Minister did not alter her attitude. She never concealed from him her hopes for his defeat, and he probably guessed that she was in communication with Salisbury and Goschen with a view to securing it. The reply he sent on May 7, a month before the division in the House, to one of her frank statements that she could not support him when she saw 'the union of the Empire in danger of disintegration,' was most likely meant to convey a polite warning: 'Mr Gladstone is most humbly sensible of your Majesty's desire to give an unvarying constitutional support to those who may have the honour to be your Majesty's advisers, and he fully enters into your Majesty's expression of pain on this occasion which nothing, as he trusts, will be done on his part to aggravate.' But, after as well as before this letter we find the Queen in frequent consultation, by letter and by interview, with Goschen, Salisbury, and Hartington, as to the best means of defeating her Minister in the House and in the country. 'We must organise the opposition to these dangerous Bills,' she wrote to Goschen on April 25, making herself, it would seem, one of the Opposition leaders. On April 11 she arranged for Goschen to tell Chamberlain, what Gladstone had at that time not told him, her exact words about giving him leave to explain his differences with the Cabinet. And when the defeat grows more probable she consults Goschen and Salisbury as to whether she should agree to a dissolution on Gladstone's request, all three being undisguisedly guided by their view of the likeliest time and method of defeating him.

What is to be said of such action as this? The Queen cannot be accused of treachery, any more than George III could: for concealment is of the essence of treachery; and neither Fox nor Gladstone had any doubt of the Sovereign's feelings. But Gladstone's word 'constitutional' is the word that raises the issue. What is 'constitutional support'? Is it consistent with active private opposition? Or are we to say that Gladstone had no right to use the word 'support'? And, if so, to what is the Sovereign bound, and how much freedom does his constitutional position leave him? A review is not the place, nor could the present reviewer pretend to be the man, to answer these grave and difficult questions. But

one or two tentative suggestions may be thrown out. On the one hand, it seems absurd and impossible to ask the Sovereign to 'support' Home Rule or Free Trade one year and Protection or the Union the next. A King has his opinions and feelings as well as other people, and cannot be asked to degrade himself by insincerity. All that, as it would seem, he can be reasonably bound to is the discharge, without delay or obstruction, of his official duties even when his Ministers propose a policy which he dislikes. Probably he ought not, one would say, to refuse necessary peerages to his unwelcome Ministers, as George III did, but Queen Victoria never did. But he can scarcely be bound to keep secret, either from his Ministers or from other people, his view of their policy. Indeed, he owes the first to them and the second to himself. But to go so far as Queen Victoria did is another matter, and tends to make the Sovereign just the worst thing he can be, which is the leader of a party. In the previous volume we see the Queen at one of her greatest and most beneficent moments as she successfully uses her great position to rebuke both parties to the Franchise dispute and to insist on their coming together. Probably few people will think her anti-Home Rule activities during the first six months of 1886 an evidence of equal wisdom. After all, perhaps, she owed more than she ever acknowledged to the forbearing loyalty of Gladstone. If he had resigned and said openly that he could not serve a Sovereign who was daily consulting his opponents with a view to his defeat, what could she have done? His policy was so unpopular that she might perhaps have called in Salisbury, dissolved and defeated him. But it would have been a dangerous game, for Gladstone's appeal would certainly have aroused widespread sympathy; and if she had been defeated she would have been a cypher for the rest of her life.

The truth is that she never quite understood her actual position as it had been transformed by the long growth of Parliamentaryism. In law the Army was *her* army, the Empire *her* Empire, the Ministers *her* servants, the very laws themselves *her* commands issued with the consent of the two Houses. And she constantly writes to her Ministers as if this theoretic position was still the actual one. She declared, for instance, early in 1886,

that she could not allow Gladstone to propose Chamberlain's name to her for Cabinet office : and she often wrote about the Army as if her wishes and views were decisive. So, again, because she hated and distrusted Russia, she was always inclined to expect Ministers to take more active measures than they approved against Russian aggression, especially, of course, in the matter of the outrageous kidnapping of her son-in-law's brother, Alexander of Bulgaria. She was justly indignant with Randolph Churchill for letting a Russian statesman know that he disapproved of her policy about Bulgaria, and desired Salisbury 'through Mr Balfour or some one to *get at* this impertinent and *not* reliable or loyal ex-Minister of hers.' 'She does what she knows is right, and will not be deterred by gossip.' She would be 'ready to fight to prevent Russia being all powerful in the Black Sea and to prevent our honour and position being lost.' To all of which Salisbury has to reply indirectly by criticising a soldier who wished to 'court a war in the Black Sea' : a policy which he declares to be 'of doubtful wisdom in itself ; and quite impracticable under a Parliamentary Government.' Those last four words are words which she would never have used : for she never quite faced the fact to which they point. The days are over, and well over, when the private likes and dislikes of Sovereigns can be the rule of national policy.

The Queen's eagerness against Russia had every justification except prudence : and events were to show that Randolph Churchill had a better eye to the future than either she or Salisbury, when he urged that we should gain more from France and Russia than we could from Germany and Austria : and mentioned Egypt and India. Yet, strong as her personal family feelings were, she always thought first, or at any rate last, of England and never allowed either her own dignity or the interests of her family to take precedence of her duty as Queen. That comes out most clearly in the unhappy story of the illness of the Emperor Frederick and the abominable behaviour of William II and Bismarck both before and after his death. Her honesty and straightness, and indeed Salisbury's too, make a very pleasant picture for an Englishman to set beside the cynical brutality and avowed double-dealing of Bismarck, and what the Queen justly calls the

'vulgarity and absurdity' (though even they were not his worst faults) of that 'hot-headed, conceited, and wrong-headed young man' William II. Well might she say, as Sir Frederick Ponsonby's 'Letters of Empress Frederick' show her saying, 'It is impossible for us straightforward English to understand' how people can 'play such a double game' as these two played: and we are not surprised at her comment to Salisbury, 'Thank God, we are English!'

English she was, and as straightforward as English; but it is often not till posterity comes to sit in the judgment seat that such straightness as hers and her daughter's gets its vindication. Bismarck had two objects in view: to humiliate his old opponent the Empress, and to do a little political business with Russia which hated Alexander of Bulgaria and did not love England or the Queen. He had no difficulty, with the help of his reptile press, in making people believe that the Queen had promoted the suggested Battenberg marriage, and that the Empress had insulted the German doctors by insisting on putting an Englishman over them. It was nothing that he knew the first to be untrue, and, as to the second, knew that it was he himself who had first proposed to call in Mackenzie! Salisbury, who saw that Bismarck was trying to discredit the Queen, and being 'quite unscrupulous,' would stop at nothing, urged the Queen not to go to Berlin, as he afterwards urged her not to let the widowed Empress come to England too soon. To these rather cowardly suggestions she replied with an emphatic negative and, in fact, disregarded them both. She was not afraid of Bismarck, whoever else was. Indeed, he seems to have been more afraid of her. He asked for an audience of her at Berlin, and it is amusing to hear from Lord Stamfordham, who helped Sir Henry Ponsonby to receive him, that he was 'unmistakably nervous and ill at ease: asked whereabouts in the room the Queen would be, would she be seated or standing,' etc. 'We both felt proud,' he adds, 'that this great man evidently realised he was about to be received by an equally great, or even greater, woman.' No doubt he got his own back by deceiving the Queen into finding him 'amiable and gentle,' and making promises to her which he had no intention of keeping, and in fact broke the moment the Emperor was

dead. Still, perhaps, he was really somewhat impressed by her : certainly things went smoother for a time after her visit, and he wrote enthusiastically of her to the German Ambassador at Vienna. But was that letter written for the purpose of being shown ?

Anyhow the Queen had consulted both her duty and dignity. But Bismarck and her grandson, to neither of whom either duty or the better kind of dignity meant much, behaved abominably to the widowed Empress, as well as to the Prince of Wales, directly the Emperor was dead. That ugly story receives new illustration in the letters printed here. The Queen was in a difficult position. Her daughter and her son had been grossly insulted both by the Emperor and by his Minister. Everything had been done at Berlin to humiliate the Empress, and the Prince of Wales had been informed through the German Ambassador at Vienna, that the Emperor declined to meet him. In both of these affairs the Emperor was partly, no doubt, the unconscious tool of Bismarck, who feared Liberalism at Berlin and English influence at Vienna, especially when embodied in the Prince of Wales, so much more made to be liked than William II. But William showed himself only too apt a pupil. Yet it remained true that he and Bismarck, after all, were Germany : and it was not England's interest to quarrel with them, as Salisbury had wisely told the Queen even before the young Emperor's accession. The problem was how to avoid a quarrel while giving such indications of resentment as would at once safeguard the Queen's dignity and show them that civility did not mean fear. Nothing is ever gained by letting bullies suppose you are afraid of them. On the whole the Queen seems to have steered a very wise middle course. She was angry, but not so angry as the Empress Frederick and the Prince of Wales wished her to be. She was civil, but not quite so civil as Salisbury desired. The first thing was to snub the childish self-importance of William II and show resentment of his impertinence to his mother and uncle. That was done at once by giving a very cold reception to General Winterfeldt, whom he sent to announce his accession. 'The Queen,' we read, 'is extremely glad to hear that General Winterfeldt says he was received coldly though civilly : for such was her *intention*.' She also

requested Salisbury to be 'very cool, though civil,' in communications with Berlin. And Salisbury at her desire warned the German Ambassador 'to prevent any proposal from the Emperor to visit England at present, as it would not be accepted.' And, in fact, he did not come till the next year. But at the same time, the Queen wrote civilly to him, and tried to smooth down the quarrel between him and his mother. And, rightly or wrongly, she did not ultimately maintain her insistence on a letter of apology to the Prince of Wales as a condition of receiving her grandson. It is clear now that the Prince had, for once in his life, shown a lack of 'savoir faire' and prudence in talking to Herbert Bismarck about the Alsace and Hanover questions at the time of the Emperor Frederick's funeral. He ought to have instinctively felt that such questions from him would be resented, and that, the Bismarcks being what they were, would be made the groundwork for a whole edifice of lies. Probably it was Bismarck who made the German Ambassador at Vienna falsely (if it was falsely) assert that the Emperor refused to see the Prince of Wales. The Emperor was much less untruthful than they: and probably his denial was the truth. But he ought to have seen that he was responsible for his Ambassador, and owed an apology to his uncle. His swelled head, however, made that impossible to him. One sympathises as one reads the story here, most of all perhaps with Prince Christian, charged with the very delicate duty of mediator at Berlin: with the Queen, divided between her just indignation and her sense of political expedience: and with the Prince of Wales who, when the Queen decided to receive the Emperor, not unnaturally felt himself to be 'sacrificed by Lord Salisbury to political expediency,' and complained that 'no one who has the power has the nerve to insist on proper reparation.' One wonders whether the fallen Emperor now ever asks himself whether he would not have been wiser to pay a little less attention to his own vanity and a little more to the good-natured uncle whose genial popularity was later on to contribute not a little to the solidity of the structure against which he and Germany ultimately dashed themselves to ruin.

But these greatest topics are as far from occupying the whole field in this new volume, as they were in its

predecessors. The Queen was a very active woman in mind as well as in body, and most of all in heart. The only important things in which she took no real interest at all were art and literature. For the rest she goes out eagerly to meet everything that happens, and, old and weary as she occasionally confesses herself to be, she never gives the impression of being bored or indifferent. Whatever the news that comes and wherever it comes from, France or Germany or Bulgaria, India or Africa or Australia, it finds in her always an interested, often an indignant, sometimes a proud and delighted listener. She is very conscious of herself as the supreme centre of her vast Empire. No Sovereign before her had ever really looked across the seas or been aware of himself as anything but King of England. She was passionately proud of her worldwide Dominions and always ready to do anything she could to show them her pride and affection. If the British Empire is destined to endure, its historian will certainly have to place the remote and mysterious figure of the almost invisible Queen-Empress among its founders. The sense of unity and loyalty, first made conspicuous to all the world in her Jubilee of 1887, was largely the creation of her character and personality, aided, no doubt, by her sex. From the India of the Mutiny to the India of the Jubilee was a long step, and it was she as much as any one who made the taking of it possible. We get here her own account of the great day. It is, like everything of hers, very simple, with more heart than head in it. Its most remarkable feature is probably its enormous length, which proves once more that whatever else tired her, writing never did. Here is a woman aged sixty-eight who goes through a long and arduous day: involving drives through London, the Abbey service, large parties at the Palace both for luncheon and dinner, at all of which she had herself to be the central figure, and, except when in the Abbey or in her carriage, to be facing that most fatiguing of all duties, the finding of civil remarks to make to great personages whom she could not particularly want to see; and when it is all over, and the European Royalties and Indian Princes, the Ambassadors and Ministers, all at last departed, this indomitable old lady is apparently able, next day if not that night, to sit down and write an account of the whole which runs to not far

short of three thousand words! Her energy is shown soon afterwards in a very different matter. How many women of sixty-eight are prepared to set themselves to learn a new language? The Queen was; and one utterly unconnected with any she knew. Directly after the Jubilee was over she began having Indian servants which she continued for the rest of her reign, and before long, one of these, Abdul Karim, later the too well-known Munshi (whose name, with many others, that of Reuss for instance, does not appear in the Index), was teaching the Queen the language, or one of them, of her Indian subjects. If she had ever understood intellectual values, she would no doubt have chosen a better teacher than this footman, as he originally was. But the foolishness of her choice of an instructor cannot alter our surprised admiration of the busy old woman's courage and energy in attempting so difficult a business at all. She always took a special interest in India, and we find her here, in the Jubilee year, writing a personal letter to the Rao of Kutch, and receiving one from the wife of the King of Oudh. Altogether that year was not only a crowded but also for her a very happy and prosperous one, except for the beginnings of the illness of the German Crown Prince. She made several very successful visits to London, she could not but be gratified by the wonderful receptions she got and by hearing of such enthusiasm in India that her image was carried about the streets and accompanied by religious processions chanting prayers for her long life, while Irish attempts to arouse disloyalty in Canada produced 'a remarkable outburst,' as Lord Lansdowne reported to her, of the exactly opposite sort of feeling. Besides, all through the years after the trustworthy Goschen had been substituted for Randolph Churchill whom Salisbury as well as the Queen regarded as 'a most selfish statesman not caring for the good of the country,' she had a Ministry whom she liked and generally agreed with, which saved her much of the explosive ink she was in the habit of tiring herself by pouring out in less happy years. So the last words of her 1887 Journal are as happy as they are characteristic of her mingled simplicity and pride.

'Osborne, 31st Dec. 1887. Went upstairs and Jane C. read to me, and I remained quietly writing. After twelve
Vol. 256.—No. 507. B

Beatrice and Liko (Prince Henry of Battenberg) came in and wished me a happy New Year.

'It was with great regret that I parted with the old eventful one. The Jubilee time was so richly blessed, not one mishap or disturbance, not one bad day, including the last pretty little ceremony of the unveiling of my statue at Balmoral. Never, never can I forget this brilliant year, so full of the marvellous kindness, loyalty, and devotion of so many millions, which really I could hardly have expected. I felt sadly the absence of those dear ones who would so entirely have rejoiced in this eventful time. Then how thankful I must be for darling Beatrice coming safely through her severe confinement, and now again in the great improvement in dear Fritz's condition! We had been in such terrible anxiety about him in November. May God help me further!'

That is as commonplace an entry as any in the Journal. But there is none more characteristic of the woman as she privately was, very much aware that she was a Queen and very proud of it, but laying aside altogether the formidable dignity which frightened her Ministers and overawed all strangers who came into her presence, even, as we have seen, the great Bismarck: and giving herself up to the simplest domesticities, sympathies, memories, and pieties!

That is always the contrast: the simple-minded woman, widow, mother, friend, who spoke to her people in times of joy and sorrow through her heart as none of her predecessors had known how to do: and the other figure, whom only Ministers and foreign potentates saw, tenacious and insistent in will, a storehouse of strong prejudices which never lacked expression in the most vigorous language, a Sovereign who never forgot or allowed others to forget that she was the Queen, and that her Ministers, whatever their pretensions, were still her subjects and, compared with her august permanence, were transient figures of temporary importance. It is this which was the ever-present irritant producing the frequent passages of tartness in her correspondence with her Ministers, especially, of course, with Gladstone, but also occasionally with nearly all the others, even with Salisbury. They knew her limitations, and knew that both the responsibility and the power of political decisions could only ultimately rest with them. To that fact she was always half blinded by the deferential

language employed in addressing her, and, one may add, by the increasing Conservatism natural to her age and sex.

So in the dispute about the Commander-in-Chief she is inclined to expect her Ministers to put on Royal family spectacles before they approach the question. When the Hartington Commission reported in favour of the abolition of the office, and when at the same time Stanhope refused to appoint the Duke of Connaught either to the Adjutant-Generalcy or to the Indian Command, the Queen was very angry. She writes of 'this really abominable Report, which she is beyond measure shocked should have emanated from a Conservative Government'; and insists 'that nothing whatever should be done, decided, or said' in the matter during her absence, and 'that the Army must remain as heretofore in direct communication with the Sovereign through the C.-in-C., who is unpolitical and who with the assent of the S. of War must have the dispensation of patronage.' Both Roberts and Wolseley agreed with her in wishing to keep the Army under the Sovereign and under a military non-political head. Wolseley wrote that all the difficulty about promoting the Duke of Connaught and securing proper powers to the Commander-in-Chief had really been caused by the Duke of Cambridge, who 'has prevented nearly all reform in our military organisation for years past.' But he was strongly in favour of the Duke of Connaught being appointed Adjutant-General or Commander-in-Chief. The opposition to this roused the indignation of the Queen, who writes that she 'cannot and will not submit to the *shameful principle* that Princes are to suffer for *their birth* in a monarchical country. Have a Republic at once if that is the principle!' Fiercely patriotic as she was, she evidently allowed her personal and family feelings to blind her to the caution imposed upon Ministers by the failure of the existing Royal Commander-in-Chief and by their experience of the difficulty of either controlling or removing a Prince of the Blood. Ultimately, as usual in England, the dispute was ended by a compromise. The Queen was assured that Salisbury would 'put his foot down' and 'not allow any of the wild and unwise proposals to pass.' The Duke of Cambridge remained Commander-in-Chief for a while, and the Duke of Con-

naught received a minor command which was soon followed by Aldershot and Ireland.

A happier personal interference of the Queen is seen in the matter of Episcopal appointments. Here she had no family interests to serve and had always at hand the very best adviser in the young Randall Davidson, Dean of Windsor. But even here her sense of her own importance deceives her into the absurdity of treating his position as her own Dean and Chaplain as too important to allow of his being removed to a Bishopric, and it requires all his remarkable tact to correct this notion without offending her. When she told him that Salisbury had mentioned his name for a Bishopric she evidently expected he would say he could not think of leaving her; and she is constrained to write to Ponsonby wondering 'if the Dean is at all an ambitious man,' and wishing she had not mentioned the matter to him. The absurdity of keeping such a man in such a position as the Windsor Deanery never struck her at all. However, he did not forfeit her favour, and with his help she comes out very well in the correspondence with Salisbury, who, one is surprised to see, had not altogether shaken off Disraeli's habit of considering what his party would think of an appointment, and still less abandoned the notion of balancing High Church appointments with Low and Low with High. The Queen and Davidson, on the other hand, with Archbishop Benson and Dean Vaughan supporting, seem merely to want the best man who can be found; except that the Queen exhibits an amusing but not perhaps unwise prejudice against clerics who have 'not a very good or high-bred manner!' On the other hand, she rejects Lord Salisbury's suggestion of the aristocratic Dean of York deciding that he is 'not of sufficient power and weight to be suitable for a Bishop.' As soon as she has recognised, with her unfailing sense of duty, that she has no right to keep Davidson to herself, she pressed hard, with Benson's strong support, for sending him straight to Winchester, which would at once have given him the opportunity of exercising his exceptional gifts in the House of Lords, beside keeping him near her. In this she did not succeed. Salisbury insisted on appointing Thorold of Rochester whom Benson thought 'too frail in health,' and Davidson took Thorold's

place at Rochester. Here Salisbury may have been right ; for Davidson's promotion at once to so great a See might, as he urged, have seemed ' forced and unnatural ' and injured his influence. But the Queen got her way about other matters : she would not allow the promotion of Dean Cust or Canon Fleming or the appointment of Boyd Carpenter to Durham. After a long struggle she carried her nomination for that great See against Salisbury's resistance, and Lightfoot received his ideal successor who was obviously Westcott. Incidentally, it may be worth noting, in reply to cynics who suppose ecclesiastics are always struggling for promotion, that no less than five refusals of Bishoprics appear in this correspondence.

Certainly no Sovereign before Victoria ever took anything like so intelligent and useful an interest in Church appointments. Queen Caroline was a more intellectual woman and did good work, particularly in sending to Durham the greatest man who ever went there ; but she had nothing of Queen Victoria's high character ; and besides she was only a Consort, not a Sovereign. Anne is the nearest parallel, but it is one merely of occupying the throne and taking an interest in the Church ; it extends neither to character nor to ability.

Beside these greater matters the book provides, of course, on almost every page, passing glimpses of notable men and events, and of what the Queen and other great people thought of them. These years were as busy as any in her life ; she performed far more public functions than in the years before or after ; and we find her receiving or visiting all sorts of famous personages, including two German Emperors, the Emperor of Austria, two Queens of Spain, the Queen of Roumania, the Shah of Persia, and many Indian Princes. In this connection it is interesting to read a letter to Ponsonby : ' Pray say to Lord Salisbury that the Queen would on no account receive King Milan, whose conduct to his wife and generally is very disreputable.'

On those subjects, as is well known, she always took a strong line, as did both Gladstone and Salisbury. We find her discussing with Salisbury the question of the position at Court of ladies who had divorced their husbands ; and Salisbury concluding his discussion of the whole subject by saying : ' with respect to *men* who have been divorced for

their own adultery, Lord Salisbury would be very glad if your Majesty should decide to give them no social recognition of any kind. It would have a very valuable effect on public morality.' So Dilke's character was fatal to his chances with the Queen. Before Gladstone took office in 1886 the Queen told Lord Salisbury: 'Sir C. Dilke, of course, I would never accept on account of his dreadful private character'; and a little later Gladstone was apparently in favour of his removal from the Privy Council. But this is not the only ground on which the Queen intervenes in the matter of appointments, even the greatest. It is she who was the first, in 1886, to say, to the grief of Gladstone, that Granville could not return to the Foreign Office, and to suggest Rosebery in his place. It was she, too, who first suggested Lansdowne for the Viceroyalty of India. It was almost certainly her personal favour for Cross, whom she called her 'friend,' which kept him in office after the General Election of 1886, though she could not save him from being removed to the House of Lords. She actively intervenes to support Salisbury in declining to facilitate Randolph Churchill's return to the Ministry, and was no doubt very glad when the danger of a Churchill-Beach 'cave,' against which Hartington had warned Salisbury, was averted by Beach alone being got back into the Cabinet. She was always keeping Hartington up to the mark in the matter of supporting Salisbury, and with that object prevented him from paying a visit to India in the autumn of 1886.

The Ministers to whom she writes most warmly are Salisbury and Rosebery. She even offered Salisbury a Dukedom after his brief term of office in 1885. With Rosebery she remained on very friendly terms after he left office, and we have here several very loyal but rather elaborate and ceremonious letters which he sent her at her Jubilee and on other occasions. Gladstone, of course, she never liked, and, to tell the truth, she never quite did him justice. But they had nothing in common except character; and the Queen naturally disliked his policies and such demagogies as his talk about the 'classes and the masses.' We find Rosebery discussing him with her and calling him 'terribly ill-advised'; and—what is curious—we find her in 1890 getting reports about his reception at Edinburgh from the Minister of St Giles's,

who informs her, no doubt to her delight, that Gladstone 'when he drives about gets nothing like the ovation he used to receive.' She carries her petulance so far as to write to Salisbury that she is 'anxious to support him in every way because it is of more than vital importance that the Socialist Home-ruling party which really contains no one of respectability' (it contained Granville, Spencer, Ripon, Rosebery, Kimberley and others!), should not return to office. So in spite of Gladstone's devoted loyalty to her, she was bitter enough to contemplate omitting his name from Court invitations; an un wisdom and ungraciousness against which Salisbury protested. In this and other matters, as in her refusal to listen to Ponsonby and the Prince of Wales, who very properly urged her return to Windsor during a Cabinet crisis, she showed herself a rather wilful woman. But who that had become a Sovereign at eighteen would not have acquired a little wilfulness in the course of fifty years?

One of the pleasantest items of her personal relations as we see them here is her repeated praise of the Prince of Wales, whom she more than once calls 'a very good son,' 'with a warm, affectionate heart.' And, indeed, though he had faults which were not her faults and were particularly distasteful to her, the praise was well deserved. Whatever he failed in it was not in loyalty to his mother. Archbishop Davidson used to say that he had never heard him at any time say one syllable of criticism of his mother, which was, he added, more than he could say of others of her children to whom she showed much greater favour. But her motherly and grandmotherly affections were among the strongest things in her; and here we see them embracing all her descendants, from her eldest daughter the Empress to the Battenberg children and 'little fat Patsy' of Connaught. A wider kindliness is seen in her visit to a footman who was dying. Nor did her good nature always take a serious shape. It is amusing, and surprising, to read an entry in her Journal written at Balmoral in 1890, when she was past seventy-one: 'After dinner the other ladies and gentlemen joined us in the Drawing room, and we pushed' (as if she herself had been one of the pushers) 'the furniture back and had a nice little impromptu dance, Curtis's band being so

entrainant. We had a quadrille, in which I danced with Eddy !' There are not many of these little things ; but they are well worth having, for they complete the picture of the great Queen, as she will always be considered by Victorians who are proud to bear her name, and, as they believe, by history too.

No doubt this book provides occasional illustrations of the disadvantages of a system which puts at the head of the State a Person who is always in office, must always be treated with great deference, and yet is a human being of the ordinary limitations, with likes and dislikes, prejudices and passions which are not always ideally wise. Yet most of us will strongly feel that it still more illustrates the advantages of a Monarchy as compared with a Republic. The President of a Republic is a mere official. He owes all he is to a party vote ; was nothing at all before his election, and will again be nothing at all when his term has expired. He can never escape altogether from that taint of party ; never can quite secure the loyalty of a whole nation, for he is always the result of a struggle in which part of the nation was defeated. Outside his own country he hardly interests anybody at all. These things are equally true of the powerless French President and of the all-powerful President of the United States. Their office cannot give them any personal attraction. M. Fallières and Mr Taft were contemporary, as Heads of their countries, with the Emperors William II and Nicholas II. Does anybody suppose that if all were alive to-day the arrival of either of the former Presidents would anywhere arouse a quarter of the interest which that of either of the former Sovereigns would immediately create ? Sovereigns in fact are born, not made, and that is their strength. They are not officials elected and then forgotten. They have all eyes upon them from the cradle to the grave. At home and abroad they arrest attention and arouse imagination as no elected person can. Those who saw William II would remember the family that had made first Prussia and then Germany ; those who saw Nicholas II would remember Peter the Great ; and, as with our Henry VI and Henry V, so in these cases, the weakness of the descendant could not undo the glory of the descent. In Queen Victoria there was no such contrast to be got over. In her was visibly embodied the whole pageant of her ancestors, and, what-

ever the changes between their times and hers, she plainly ranked with the most glorious figures in the long line. Her task was a new one, and she had herself to discover the best way of performing it. No doubt she made mistakes, of which her invisibility was the worst. But she could not in any case have been often visible except in this island; and the new Monarchy, which she was shaping, is the centre of a wider world than Great Britain. It is her supreme achievement that she made her name one of mysterious glory and power, one that aroused a worshipping loyalty and love, in remote continents and islands, and among peoples who could never hope to see her face. When Rome became a world-wide Empire it had to have a central figure symbolic of its unity; and as Gauls and Egyptians who had never seen him looked up with awe to the Roman Cæsar, so Canadians and Australians, Indians and Africans, gave to the invisible Queen an honour and a love they would never have given to any President, and found a charm, mysterious and almost magical, in the great name of Victoria.

JOHN BAILEY.

Art. 2.—THE RETREAT OF 1914 AND THE BATTLE OF THE MARNE.

1. *Liaison*, 1914. By Brigadier-General E. L. Spears. Heinemann, 1930.
2. *Military Operations, France and Belgium*, 1914. By Brigadier-General J. E. Edmonds. Macmillan, 1922.
3. 1914. By Field-Marshal Viscount French. Constable, 1919.
4. *The World Crisis*, 1916–1918. Part I. By the Rt Hon. Winston Churchill. Thornton Butterworth, 1927.
5. *Les Armées Françaises dans la Grande Guerre*. Tome I, vol. II et Annexes. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1925.
6. *Mémoires du Maréchal Gallieni*. Défense de Paris. Paris: Payot, 1920.

BRIGADIER-GENERAL SPEARS was, on the outbreak of the Great War, appointed to be liaison officer between the headquarters of Lanrezac's 5th Army, which was on our right, and our own G.H.Q. He was with that army during the retreat of 1914 and the battles of the Marne and Aisne, and in his 'Liaison, 1914,' he gives the account of an eye-witness of the stirring events of that period from a point of view which will be new to most English readers. His portraits of French officers and soldiers working under stress are sympathetic and understanding, and he has a gift of description. On these accounts his book is worth reading, but it is more than a moving and stirring story of one of the very few periods of the war which has dramatic interest. As Mr Winston Churchill says in his introduction to the book: 'No part of the Great War compares in interest with its opening. . . . General Spears' account is a definite and new contribution to our knowledge of this opening phase.' My first reflection on reading General Spears' account of the relations between the French 5th Army and our Expeditionary Force is that the French were less careful than we were to make easy the difficult business of co-operation with an Allied Army. This is understandable, for in every great war in which we have taken part on the Continent of Europe, from the beginnings of our standing army, we had fought as and with allies, and we have had ample experience of the difficulties of arriving

at mutual understanding, particularly in the early period of a war. But seeing that the informal conversations between the French and British General Staffs, which resulted in the preparation of our plan of campaign, were authorised by Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman in January 1906, and the French General Staff had, therefore, more than eight years in which to consider the problem, it is clear from General Spears' story that they were guilty of omissions which had serious consequences. No care was taken to see that the French troops with whom we first came in contact were worthy representatives of the French Army. The first French soldiers whom our First Corps, on our right, saw in number were Valabrègue's reserve divisions, retiring despondently and in some confusion from the neighbourhood of Maubeuge; while on our left the first French soldiers of whom we had experience were Territorials fleeing from the enemy in even greater despondency and yet worse confusion.

In the years before the war most of our senior officers took opportunities to know something of the French Army and of the country in which we might have to fight. A few senior French officers came to England occasionally; Foch paid us a visit in 1910, and that visit and his friendship with Sir Henry Wilson gave him a knowledge of us and of our ways which few of his colleagues possessed. Certainly it was not possessed by Lanrezac, chosen to command the army which was to co-operate closely with us, nor by any of the senior officers of his staff. Lanrezac had a great reputation in the French army before the war as an able and energetic commander; but, like many regular officers of that period, he had little faith in the value in war of any soldiers other than the regulars whom he knew. He did not believe in his own reserve divisions, and still less in the French Territorials; and as Spears says: 'Any one who has read General Lanrezac's book will see . . . that neither the British, nor the Belgians for that matter, found favour in his eyes. He was apt to lump them in with his own Reserve Divisions as being all equally useless. During the whole period of his command he never saw a British unit.' We at least landed in France with some knowledge and a high opinion of the French Army, and with the heartiest desire to co-operate with

it. Sir John French, after meeting Joffre, wrote to Lord Kitchener: 'I am much impressed with all I have seen of the French General Staff. They are very deliberate, calm, and confident. There was a total absence of fuss and confusion, and a determination to give only a just and proper value to any success.' But when our Commander-in-Chief paid his first visit to Lanrezac the atmosphere changed, and for the worse. Spears' account of that meeting is sad reading:

'Sir John, stepping up to a map in the 3^{me} Bureau, took out his glasses, located a place with his finger, and said to Lanrezac: "Mon Général, est-ce que—" His French gave out, and turning to one of his staff he asked: "How do you say 'to cross the river' in French?" He was told, and proceeded: "Est-ce que les Allemands vont traverser la Meuse à— à—" Then he fumbled over the pronunciation of the name. "Huy" was the place, unfortunately one of the most difficult words imaginable to pronounce, the "u" having practically to be whistled. It was quite beyond Sir John. "Hoy," he said at last triumphantly. "What does he say? What does he say?" exclaimed Lanrezac. Somebody explained that the Marshal wanted to know whether, in his opinion, the Germans were going to cross the river at Huy. Lanrezac shrugged his shoulders impatiently. "Tell the Marshal," he said, "that in my opinion the Germans have merely gone to the Meuse to fish." This story gives some idea of Lanrezac's mentality and manners. Evidently his conversation with Sir John had put him out of temper, and he did not hesitate to show it by being deliberately rude.'

French's comment on the interview is more than justified: 'He was a big man with a loud voice, but his manner did not strike me as being very courteous.' Sir John was big enough not to be ruffled by rudeness, but to rudeness were added other causes of friction. The South African War had given us valuable lessons in the use of mounted troops. We had armed our cavalry with the same rifle as the infantry had, they were good shots, and as accustomed to work on foot as on horseback. This, while it did not in any way detract from their usefulness in reconnaissance, enabled them to serve when needed as a valuable mobile reserve. The French cavalry was trained and equipped only to fight mounted.

'Indeed,' as Spears says, 'the French cavalry was not equipped for modern warfare at all. The firearm was the "mousequeton," a ridiculous little popgun. The Cuirassier regiments, magnificent to look at in their armour, seemed accoutred to take on the bowmen of Agincourt. The dragoons had the same steel helmets as the cuirassiers, with a horse-hair plume hanging down their backs.'

Lanrezac, accustomed to cavalymen who sat on their horses, whether halted or moving, so as to be ready for an immediate charge, could not understand Sir John when, in halting French, he tried to explain his methods of using his horsemen, and he reported to Joffre that 'the British cavalry . . . will be employed as mounted infantry in the line and cannot be counted upon for any other purpose.' Lanrezac appears to have regarded these ideas on the employment of cavalry as such as might be expected of an ignorant British soldier. In fact, our cavalry preceded the advance of our little army to Mons, and under Allenby was, as Sir John handsomely acknowledges, as successful as cavalry could have been expected to be in discovering the direction and strength of the enemy's movements. This information confirmed that obtained by the Intelligence section of our G.H.Q. under Colonel (now Sir George) Macdonogh, the best Intelligence officer in any of the three armies, British, French, or German. Unfortunately, our operations section preferred to rely upon the estimates of German strength made at the French Headquarters, and snubbed our cavalry for their pains.*

The misunderstanding by the French Intelligence department of the strength of the German right had consequences which were nearly fatal. General Spears gives a graphic picture of it in one of the admirable maps prepared for him by Sir Morgan Crofton. Acting on the incorrect information supplied to him, Joffre directed his 5th Army, with ours on its left, to advance and act, in conjunction with the Belgians, offensively against what he believed to be the comparatively weak German forces in Belgium north of the Meuse. Lanrezac, as he approached the Sambre and more and more information of the enemy's movements came in, very justly liked

* 'France and Belgium, 1914,' p. 456.

this plan less and less, and in the event decided to stand defensively on the river; but he made the unpardonable omission of not letting Sir John French know of his change of plans. When we arrived at Mons, on Aug. 22, our front on the Condé Canal was the best part of a day's march ahead of Lanrezac's left, and we were preparing to cross the canal and advance. Spears describes how, after vainly trying to get Lanrezac to inform Sir John of the real situation and plans of the 5th Army, he went on his own initiative to our G.H.Q. at Le Cateau, and on arriving there late in the evening found the chiefs of staff of our army corps, who had come in for orders, eagerly discussing the next day's forward movement. The description of the scene at G.H.Q. that evening is one of his dramatic passages. On learning the truth, French decided to stand defensively about Mons, but it was a rude shock to him to find that for three days his immediate neighbour had kept him in the dark. Worse was to follow, for on the 23rd Lanrezac ordered a general retreat, without any attempt to concert his movements with those of our army, which was fighting at Mons a long way in front of his left and exposed to the full force of von Kluck's envelopment. It is not, then, surprising that Sir John lost any remains of confidence which he had in Lanrezac, nor that for a time his want of confidence should have extended to his French Allies in general.

With the facts before us we cannot but conclude that Lanrezac was right to stand on the defensive, and that to escape the German envelopment a retreat was inevitable. I am unable to agree with General Spears' suggestion that a determined and timely counter-offensive on Lanrezac's part might have restored the situation. But there can be little doubt that with better understanding between Lanrezac and Sir John French, for the lack of which the French commander was responsible, as well as with more resolute leading on his part, and, above all, with a better understanding by the French army of the uses of defence, the retreat need not have been so long and so costly as it was. The legend of the overwhelming superiority of the Germans at the beginning of the war dies hard. Mr. Churchill, in the third volume of his 'World Crisis,' published in 1927, says of the Germans: 'At Charleroi they were three to one.'

The strength of Lanrezac's army is given by our official historian as 254,000, the strength of von Bülow's 2nd Army and von Hausen's 3rd Army as 260,000 and 180,000 respectively; but von Hausen did not develop his strength until well into the afternoon of Aug. 23, and both he and von Bülow had to provide a corps for the siege of Namur, while another of von Bülow's corps, the 7th, was still, on Aug. 22, when he attacked Lanrezac, at a distance from the battlefield. Of the relative strengths in the earlier stages of the battle of Charleroi, Spears says:

'The Army [French 5th Army] consisted of 10 active and 3 reserve divisions, one extra brigade and the cavalry corps [three divisions]. The greatest part of this force had not been engaged until that afternoon [23rd], and the brunt of the fighting had been borne by only two corps [six divisions] the 3rd and 10th, which had been opposed by two German corps, the 10th and the Guard [four divisions]. That is, 100,000 Frenchmen were attacked by 80,000 Germans.'

In this attack von Bülow had by noon on Aug. 23 driven the French from the lower valley of the Sambre and had badly shaken the 5th Army. The reason for this is clear. Spears, describing his first visit to the Sambre front, while Lanrezac was hesitating whether to cross or not, says:

'In my wanderings, somewhat to my surprise, I saw no attempt being made anywhere to dig entrenchments. The fact that the Germans might attack us was, after all, not an impossibility. A hostile army has been known to disturb the too leisurely preparations of an opponent. An attack by the enemy in some strength was possible, and, in any case, if we were to advance across the Sambre it was an elementary precaution to prepare a strong position south of the river. Such, however, was apparently not the opinion of the commanders on the spot, for practically no digging was taking place. The troops evidently thought that, as they were going to advance, entrenchments would be useless. The whole pre-war training, or lack of training, in the French Army in this respect was telling.'

This pre-war training was a reaction against the reliance of the French army of 1870 upon defensive positions, and, as is usual with reactions, it was carried

to a violent extreme. At Mons we, too, had expected to advance, indeed our troops had only the briefest notice that they were to stand on the defensive, but as a matter of routine we had entrenched our outposts, defences which were hastily improved and extended. We were attacked on Aug. 23 by a very superior force of Germans, who by nightfall had only succeeded in driving in our outposts. The French might have profited by our experience in the South African War, and have made co-operation with us easier if they had been as ready to learn from us as we were to learn from them.

The result of Sir John French's impression, amply justified, that he had been let down by Lanrezac, together with the shock of the battle of Le Cateau, on Aug. 26, when the Germans had compelled Smith-Dorrien to fight against the wishes of the Commander-in-Chief, was that he was determined, while the retreat lasted, to keep his army further from the enemy than were the French forces on his flanks. On Aug. 29, Lanrezac, acting on Joffre's instructions, stood and attacked von Bülow, gaining a considerable measure of success in the battle of Guise. On that day we were approximately as far behind Lanrezac's fighting front as we had been in front of it at Mons. But as we continued to retreat the gap widened. Thus the situation of the two armies was reversed. At Mons we had been in dire peril. Now the French 5th Army was in like peril. With von Bülow's second army on its front, von Hausen's 3rd Army menacing its right flank, and von Kluck's first army swerving towards its left flank, only a rapid retreat could extricate it. This situation, which began to develop on Aug. 30, is, I believe, the key to the battle of the Marne.

General Spears has rendered a real service in putting the story of the development of that momentous battle from the French side in a clear and readable narrative. The French official history consists of the baldest outline of events, reinforced by volumes of annexes containing what the compilers believe to be all the essential documents. It is not likely, then, to attract the lay reader, but it throws a flood of light on a controversy which has long raged in France—whether Joffre or Gallieni won the battle of the Marne. Mr Churchill has ably summed up that controversy :

'After the Marne there was a breathing-space, and immediately the voice of criticism was raised against the strategy and conduct of General Joffre. To the failure of his war plans and to the dispute about the credit of the Marne was added the charge of defective preparation for war. No other Frenchman had sat in one great position for the three years before the war; no other man had his responsibility for the condition of the French military resources. The scarcity of machine guns,* the want of heavy artillery, the absence even of field-service uniforms could all be laid to his door rather than to any other—not that it follows that any one else would have done better. Thus, while to the world-public and before the enemy, and, it must be added, in the eyes of the rank and file of the French armies, Joffre towered up as a grand figure triumphing over the tempest and the victor of the greatest and most decisive battle of history, there flowed all the time a strong subterranean current of well-informed mistrust and opposition.'

There has been a marked diminution in this flow since the appearance of the French official history, but the stream ran strongly at first. The attacks on Joffre took a political colour and were strongly pressed by those of the left in French politics, with Victor Marguerite as protagonist. It was said that Joffre had proposed to abandon Paris and Verdun, falling back behind the Seine to the east of the capital, that Gallieni had been the first to discover von Kluck's move to the south-east past the French capital, and that he had dragged a reluctant Joffre into battle and saved France. Statements of this kind in war and in post-war controversies are common, and it is not unusual for an attempt to be made to crown the brow of a lieutenant with the laurels due to his chief. When Marlborough became politically unpopular it was commonly said that the only victory which he had won without the assistance of Eugene, was Ramillies—the implication being obvious. Within our

* This is another legend of the early days of the war. The number of machine guns in a British, French, and German division was identical—twenty-four; but the German machine guns were rather better organised than were the French and ours. In addition, the Germans had one Jäger battalion with six machine guns in each army corps as corps troops, and Jäger or Schützen battalions also armed with machine guns with their cavalry. As is well known, the Germans, owing to the rapidity of our infantry fire, credited us with more machine guns than we had.

own time the attempt was made to give the credit for Kitchener's victory of Omdurman to Hector Macdonald. But the controversy has acquired importance because Gallieni and his staff have either been dragged or have entered into it, and we, whose army had the fortune to be the decisive factor in the issue of the battle, have an interest in the search for the truth.

The sequence of events is now, except for one short period, beyond dispute. It will be clear from what I have said that Joffre had no light task in pulling together his menaced left flank. He set about the task with resolution and his personal activity was in marked contrast to the lethargy of the ailing von Moltke. On Aug. 25, when the original French plan of campaign, Plan 17, had completely broken down, Joffre issued Instruction Générale No. 2, the opening paragraph of which ran :

'It being impossible to carry out the offensive manœuvre which had been projected, future operations will have as their objective to re-form on our left a mass capable of resuming that offensive. This will consist in the Fourth, Fifth, and British Armies, together with new forces drawn from the Eastern front, while the other armies contain the enemy for as long as is necessary.'

To this plan Joffre adhered throughout the severe strain of the retreat, which threw upon him, admittedly because of the failure of his original plan, an immense burden of responsibility. He adhered to it amidst depression, friction, and misunderstandings of which General Spears gives us a lively account. He contemplated a counter-offensive on a large scale, an offensive, as he repeatedly said, with 'toutes forces réunies,' and the strongest element for this counter-offensive was the 5th Army. The 'new forces' became the French 6th Army, under General Maunoury, and was constituted on Aug. 28, when it began to assemble on our left, behind the Somme. On Aug. 31 our aircraft discovered that von Kluck's 1st Army was no longer advancing on Paris, but had changed direction and was moving south-east. In the meantime General Gallieni had been appointed Governor of Paris, and he at once set to work energetically to provide for the defence of the capital. The pressure of the enemy's advance against the Allied left continued

and compelled Joffre to envisage a postponement of his counter-offensive, and a prolongation of the retreat. On Sept. 1 he issued Instruction Générale No. 4, which began :

'In spite of the tactical successes won by the Third, Fourth, and Fifth Armies on the Meuse and at Guise, the outflanking movement against the left wing of the Fifth Army, insufficiently arrested by the British Army and the Sixth Army, constrains the forces as a whole to pivot on our right.

'As soon as the Fifth Army has escaped the menace of envelopment against its left, the Third, Fourth, and Fifth Armies will resume the offensive.' *

The intention is clear. As I have explained, the situation of the Fifth Army on Sept. 1 was critical owing to von Kluck's move against its left, and Joffre's immediate preoccupation was to disengage it so that it might be able to take an effective part in his counter-offensive. The concluding paragraph of the instruction ran : 'The mobile troops of the Paris garrison may also be required to take part in the offensive,' and on the same day Joffre communicated with his War Minister asking that the fortress of Paris should be placed under him 'in order that, if opportunity arises, he may be able to combine the operations of the mobile garrison of the fortress with those of the field armies.' † Also, on the same day, he placed Maunoury's 6th Army under Gallieni. That day, too, by a great piece of good fortune, a German cavalry officer was killed by a patrol of the French 5th Army, and on his body was found a map with the direction of march of von Kluck's columns, confirming the information obtained by our aircraft. On Sept. 2, German cavalry appeared at Château-Thierry on the Marne, threatening the left flank and communications of the 5th Army, causing Joffre renewed anxiety for the safety of that army, and some doubt as to when it would be

* As General Spears points out, there were variations in the copy of this order sent to the British Army. 'Liaison, 1914,' p. 543.

† 'Les Armées Françaises,' Annexe 1785. On Sept. 2, Joffre, on receiving the minister's consent, sent a note to his army commanders saying, that in the forthcoming offensive 'the garrison of Paris will act in the direction of Meaux,' and that the British Army would be asked to co-operate.

ready for the offensive. Early on Sept. 3, British aircraft again confirmed the information that von Kluck's columns were moving south-east, and at 6.30 p.m. that evening, Gallieni learned for the first time that patrols of his 6th Army had discovered the direction of von Kluck's movement. As, for some reason which is not clear, Joffre's headquarters had not informed the Governor of Paris of the facts which had been for some time in their possession, he not unnaturally assumed that his people were the first to make this vitally important discovery. In the introduction to the '*Mémoires du Maréchal Gallieni*' we are told that these were written by him during the war and put away. They were published by his family after his death without that revision which the Marshal would doubtless have given them had he lived. They have furnished to the opponents of Joffre their chief supply of ammunition, but in the conditions in which they were prepared they need careful checking with the available documents.

Gallieni at once saw the opportunity which the march of von Kluck, with its flank exposed to Paris, afforded, but, wishing to be certain of the facts, he waited before taking action until the information was confirmed by reconnaissance early on Sept. 4. Up till 6.30 p.m. on Sept. 3, Gallieni had been, quite rightly, entirely occupied with the defence of Paris. Late on Sept. 3, and before Gallieni had made any proposal for attack by the 6th Army on von Kluck's flank, Joffre sent the following to Gallieni :

'Part of General Maunoury's Army should be pushed at once towards the east to menace the German right flank, in order that the left of the British Army may feel that it is supported on this side. It would be well to inform Marshal French of this and to keep in constant relation with him.' *

This much, then, is clear : Joffre knew of von Kluck's movement before Gallieni. He had envisaged the co-operation of the mobile troops from Paris in his counter-offensive ; he had asked Gallieni to move part of Maunoury's army eastwards against von Kluck's flank before any suggestion for such a movement had reached him from Gallieni.

* '*Les Armées Françaises*,' Tome I, vol. II, p. 620.

The crisis was now fast approaching. Early on Sept. 4, Gallieni, with the information obtained by his reconnaissances before him, at once set about reinforcing Maunoury and preparing the 6th Army for attack upon von Kluck's flank. He telephoned, through his staff, to Joffre to inquire whether the movement of the 6th Army should be made on the north or on the south bank of the Marne, indicating plainly that he preferred attack on the north bank—that which actually took place—partly on the ground that such an attack would be the most effective, and partly because it could be the more quickly developed. He was informed by Joffre's headquarters that the Commander-in-Chief preferred the south bank, and that such delay as this movement might cause would be compensated for by an increase in the force available for attack. The reasons of this decision of Joffre's seem clear; he still desired an attack '*toutes forces réunies*'; on the forenoon of Sept. 4, the 5th Army was not yet disengaged and ready to turn about; reinforcements were still on their way to the left flank; and, lastly, he had good reason to believe, from what had already passed, that Sir John French, our army being then well south of the Marne, would be reluctant to attack unless he was well supported on both his flanks.

At 1.30 p.m. on Sept. 4, Gallieni left Paris to go to Melun, where our G.H.Q. was established, probably in consequence of Joffre's suggestion to him of Sept. 3. His object was to draw up a plan for the co-operation of the 6th and British Armies in an attack on von Kluck south of the Marne, as Joffre had directed. French was unfortunately away seeing his troops, and Sir Archibald Murray, his Chief of the Staff, was naturally unwilling to commit his Chief. But a plan of action was drawn up to be subject to Sir John's approval. It was that, on Sept. 5, the 6th Army should move to the Marne between Meaux and Lagny, cross the river to the south bank the next day and move east against von Kluck's flank, while the British Army was to pivot on its right, so as to come up in line with the 6th Army and also advance eastwards in conjunction with that army. Nothing was said about the action of the 5th Army, which Gallieni was not in a position to arrange. This plan, when drawn up, was taken by a staff officer to Joffre's headquarters

where he arrived about 10 p.m. Gallieni, about 5 p.m., left Melun for Paris.

Meanwhile, a more momentous conference had been held elsewhere. On Sept. 3, Joffre had personally dismissed Lanrezac and placed Franchet d'Esperey in command of the 5th Army. The change had much the same effect as has the replacement of a nervous rider on a good horse by one who has confidence in himself. At 12.45 p.m. on Sept. 4, Joffre, possibly in consequence of the messages which had passed between Gallieni and himself in the morning, telegraphed to Franchet d'Esperey: 'Circumstances are such that it might be advantageous to deliver battle to-morrow or the day after with all the forces of the Fifth Army in concert with the British Army and the mobile forces of Paris, against the First and Second German Armies. Inform me if you consider your army can do this with prospect of success. Immediate answer.' When this message arrived Franchet d'Esperey was expecting Sir John French. Instead there arrived General (afterwards Field Marshal Sir Henry) Wilson and Colonel Macdonogh. Spears was present at the ensuing conference and has given us a full and interesting account of it, from which it appears that the chief credit for the British share in shaping the plan should go to the clear-headed Macdonogh, and not, as I had supposed, to Wilson. Immediately after the meeting Franchet d'Esperey telegraphed to Joffre at 4 p.m.:

'The battle can only take place the day after to-morrow, Sept. 6. To-morrow, Sept. 5, the 5th Army will continue its retreat to the line Provins—Sézanne. The English Army will make a change of direction to the east on the line Changis—Coulommiers and to the south, on condition that its left flank is supported by the 6th Army, which should advance to the line of the Ourcq to the north of Lizy-sur-Ourcq to-morrow, Sept. 5. On the 6th, the general direction of the British offensive should be Montmirail—that of the 6th Army, Château-Thierry, that of the 5th Army, Montmirail.'

Three-quarters of an hour later he followed this with another message urging that the 6th Army should be on the Ourcq on Sept. 5, 'otherwise the English will not march,' and he added that energetic co-operation by Foch's detachment would be desirable. Foch's detachment had been formed by Joffre of the left wing of the

4th Army and he had subsequently reinforced it. On Sept. 5, it became the 9th Army and was on Franchet d'Esperey's immediate right.

Joffre adopted this plan of Franchet d'Esperey's in its entirety, and, at 10 p.m. on Sept. 6, issued Instruction Générale No. 6, the orders for the battle of the Marne. Now it is obvious that d'Esperey's plan, accepted by Joffre, was in scope and detail widely different from that drawn up by Gallieni at Melun. The former was for a general attack by the 6th Army, north of the Marne, as Gallieni had originally proposed, and by the 9th, 5th, and British Armies south of the Marne, against the 1st and 2nd German armies. The latter was for an attack by the 6th Army and the British south of the Marne against von Kluck's flank. Joffre's orders, as issued, were for an attack 'toutes forces réunies' as soon as he knew that the 5th Army could take part in it. Gallieni's proposals were for a local effort on a large scale.

At or about 10 p.m., Joffre himself telephoned to Gallieni giving him a summary of Instruction Générale No. 6. It is regrettable that Gallieni should have been dragged into this controversy, for he played his part skilfully and manfully. It is even more regrettable that his 'Mémoires' should have been published without revision, for in them he claims that he issued, at 8.30 p.m. on Sept. 4—that is, about an hour and a half before Joffre's conversation with him—the orders detailing the action of the 6th Army and the British in the battle of the Marne; in short, that he had anticipated Joffre. Such a statement from such a source naturally delighted those who desired to make a scapegoat of the Commander-in-Chief. The order in question, said to have been issued at 8.30 p.m., is dated Sept. 4, 10.30 a.m., in the Appendix to Gallieni's 'Mémoires.'* At that time it will be remembered that Gallieni was in communication with Joffre as to whether he should attack north or south of the Marne, and it is very probable that his staff then prepared alternative drafts of orders for either eventuality, leaving blanks to be filled in detailing the action of the British Army, after that had been settled at Melun. But the researches of the historical section of the General Staff

* 'Mémoires,' p. 209.

show that this order did not reach the 6th Army till the morning of the 5th.* And the evidence of the order itself and Gallieni's own account go to show that it was not issued until Gallieni had heard from Joffre what his plans were. The last part of the first paragraph of Gallieni's order runs: 'The mobile forces of the Army of Paris will manœuvre so as to keep contact with the German Army and to follow it so as to be ready to take part in the forthcoming battle. The English Army has agreed to act in a similar manner.' The third paragraph directs the 6th Army to be ready to attack on the morning of the 6th 'in liaison with the English Army which will attack on the front Coulommiers—Changis.' It seems to be stretching the possibilities of coincidence very far to suppose that at ten in the morning Gallieni should have hit upon the very front for the British Army which was proposed by Franchet d'Esperey, miles away, at four in the afternoon. Further, at 10 p.m., Joffre told Gallieni that this would be the British front. In addition, the account which Gallieni gives of the events preceding the alleged issue at 8.30 p.m. of the order drafted at 10.30 a.m. bristles with inconsistencies. He says that in his interview with Sir Archibald Murray he proposed an attack by the 6th Army north of the Marne, advancing to the Ourcq while the British Army advanced to the Grand Morin and Coulommiers,† whereas the plan which he actually drew up at Melun and sent to Joffre (it is extant) was entirely different. A few pages further on, he says that the front which he indicated for the British Army was 'the approximate front Coulommiers—Nangis';‡ Nangis being 20 miles south of Coulommiers and the Grand Morin, and more than 30 miles south of Changis. Gallieni was evidently very ruffled because Sir Archibald Murray would not commit his Commander-in-Chief in his absence; and, after several pages of complaints against the unwillingness of the English to co-operate with him, he goes on: 'I will add that on my return to Paris, with the tergiversations of English headquarters particularly in my mind, I tele-

* The 6th Army had, at 11 p.m. on the 4th, received a telephonic summary of Joffre's Instruction Générale, No. 6, for the battle of the Marne.

† 'Mémoires,' p. 114.

‡ 'Mémoires,' p. 118. General Spears tells us that, curiously enough, Sir Henry Wilson made a similar confusion between Nangis and Changis.

phoned myself to General Joffre to inform him of the dispositions made, of the march to the east of the Army of Paris, with Meaux—Senlis road as the axis of the march, of the attack to be made on first contact with the troops of the 4th German Reserve corps, which was expected to take place in the afternoon, of the necessity for the co-operation of the English Army in the movement, and, lastly, of the hesitations I had encountered at English headquarters.'

General Clergerie, Gallieni's chief of the staff, says, in his book, '*Le Rôle du Gouvernement militaire de Paris*,' that such a telephonic communication with Joffre took place at 7 p.m., and one would expect that a report of Gallieni's visit to British headquarters would have been made on his return. But General Clergerie's book is unreliable in other particulars, and no record of such a conversation as Gallieni describes has been discovered in the files either of Joffre's or of Gallieni's headquarters, though there are records of all the other important communications of Sept. 4; nor is there any reference to it in the sixty-eight pages of documents attached to Gallieni's memoirs. Marshal Joffre has informed me that he has no recollection of such a conversation at 7 p.m. Gallieni's supporters maintain that this conversation was Gallieni's final urge which pushed a hesitating and wavering Joffre into the decision to fight the battle of the Marne as it was fought. But is it credible that, immediately on his return from Melun, Gallieni should have telephoned to Joffre an entirely different plan from that which he had approved and sent off two hours before to the Commander-in-Chief? Is it credible that when he was, as he insists, in grave doubt as to British co-operation, he should, before he knew Joffre's instructions and before he was assured of British co-operation, have told his army that 'the English Army has agreed to act in a similar manner,' and that it would act on a front different from that which he had arranged with Sir Archibald Murray?

It has seemed to me kinder to Gallieni to assume that, writing after the event and without revision, believing that he had been the first to discover von Kluck's march, knowing that the attack of the 6th Army north of the Marne, which actually took place, had been first suggested by him, and with flatterers at his ear who told him that

the credit for the battle was his, he had forgotten the time of Joffre's conversation with him, of which there is a record, and that his reference is really to the latter conversation. In that conversation he very probably referred to the hesitation of the British which was so much on his mind.

The case for Joffre, as set out by General Spears—a case which he might have made even stronger than he has made it—is, to me, convincing. Our own excellent official history, published some time before the French official history, sums up very fairly :

'Credit has been claimed for General Gallieni that he first discovered the eastward march of von Kluck and brought its significance to the notice of General Joffre, and that he immediately took appropriate action with the troops under his command and prevailed upon the Commander-in-Chief to change his plan for retiring behind the Seine. Be this as it may, the decision to resume the offensive rested with General Joffre.'

We know now definitely that Gallieni was not the first to discover von Kluck's movement, that Joffre first proposed the co-operation of the Army of Paris in his offensive, that he first suggested the move of that army eastwards, that Franchet d'Esperey proposed the form and date of the battle of the Marne, and that Gallieni took the most appropriate action to enable the troops under his command to co-operate.

A final step was needed to complete the plan for the Marne. I have suggested that it was probable that Joffre had heard from Gallieni that our headquarters was hesitating. To clinch the matter, Joffre, on Sept. 5, came to see Sir John French. General Spears' account of that historic interview is one of the most moving passages, amongst many such, in his book :

'General Joffre, his back half-turned to one of the windows, faced the British Commander-in-Chief. He had placed his cap on the table.

'At once he began to speak in that low, toneless, albino voice of his, saying that he had felt it his duty to come and thank Sir John personally for having taken the decision on which the fate of Europe might well depend. Sir John bowed. Then, without hurry or emphasis, Joffre explained the situation, developing the story of the German advance,

and the change of direction of the First German Army. Here he interrupted his narrative to say that the British Flying Corps had played a prominent, in fact a vital part, in watching and following this all-important movement upon which so much depended. Thanks to our aviators he had been kept accurately and constantly informed of von Kluck's movements. . . . Joffre was now foretelling what would happen on the morrow and on the day after that, and on the day after that; and, as a prophet, he was heard with absolute faith. We were listening to the story of the victory of the Marne, and we absolutely believed. The atmosphere of the room grew tenser. . . . Joffre was now talking of the British . . . the still even tone was more eloquent now with an intensity of feeling that drew our very souls out . . . turning full on Sir John, with an appeal so intense as to be irresistible, clasping both his own hands so as to hurt them, General Joffre said: "Monsieur le Maréchal, c'est la France qui vous supplie." His hands fell to his sides wearily. The effort he had made had exhausted him.

'We all looked at Sir John. He tried to say something in French. For a moment he struggled with his feelings and with the language, then, turning to an English officer, I think it was Major Clive who stood by him, he exclaimed, "Damn it, I can't explain. Tell him that all that men can do our fellows will do."'

F. MAURICE.

Art. 3. OXFORD—CAMBRIDGE; CAMBRIDGE—OXFORD.

'In intellectual activity, and in readiness to admit improvement, the superiority was then, as it has ever been since, on the side of the less ancient and splendid institution.' This concession of a certain pride of place to the Sister University on the part of Macaulay was merely a gambit preluding a vicious and uncalled-for attack, wherein, as not infrequently occurred, he over-reached himself, thus: 'Cambridge had the honour of educating those celebrated Protestant Bishops whom Oxford had the honour of burning.' Now, it cannot be denied that Cranmer, Latimer, and Ridley, who suffered martyrdom at Oxford, were Cambridge men, but also it cannot be denied that Stephen Gardiner hailed from Trinity Hall. This is not the only blunder, from a Cambridge point of view at least, in this remarkable indictment. It is strange that Macaulay escaped being taken to task, if he did escape, for admitting that Oxford was the senior University. The two Sisters, amongst many other curious points of resemblance, are as sensitive as middle-aged maiden ladies on the question of age. Only the learned Sisters view the question from a position exactly opposite to that generally taken. The claim is not only that each is older than the other—but the older the better.

There is only one Oxford, and there is only one Cambridge. No other University in Great Britain or Europe or anywhere else approaches either, except in the matter of education. In other respects they are distinct, separate, unapproachable. They both came into being in the same century, and developed much on the same lines. Consequently, it is not remarkable that there should be a general resemblance in their administration. It is, in fact, impossible to distinguish the output of one University from the other after such output has left the *status pupillaris*, without direct information. Of course, neither Oxford nor Cambridge will admit this in their callow days. The Junkers regard each other with mutual contempt, which in some cases athletic rivalry modifies to at least temporary mutual admiration, and maturity softens or should soften into mutual esteem. Some of the

skirmishes of badinage between the younger generations are amusing. Here be two examples.

Oxford's Jacobite predilections more than once attracted the attention, though not the favour, of royalty, subsequent to the Revolution. Cambridge, on the other hand, found its way into the Crown's good books and was subsequently rewarded in kind by the presentation of the priceless Library of Doctor Moore, Bishop of Ely. Oxford, if it felt the rebuff, seized the opportunity and wrote :

'The King, observing with judicious eyes
The state of both his Universities,
To Oxford sent a troop of horse ; and why ?
That learned body wanted loyalty.
To Cambridge books he sent, as well discerning
How much that loyal body wanted learning.'

Later, and no less happily, comes this story from Cambridge. An undergraduate from that University was wandering down the 'High' at Oxford, and a Proctor, seeing what he deemed to be lawful prize, 'not in academic dress,' bore down on him with the question : 'Are you a member of this University ?' 'Have you a University hyar ?' was the reply. Such skirmishes are witty and entertaining. Unhappily it is difficult to regard with complacency 'the incensed points of mighty opposites,' the wrangles as to which University is senior.

Oxford claims to have been founded by Alfred the Great. Nevertheless, no mention is made of his name in the Bidding Prayer at the University Church of St Mary the Virgin, wherein all the Benefactors of the University are commemorated. This seems to suggest a doubt as to the authenticity of the claim. On the other hand, University College maintains that it was assuredly founded by Alfred, and reverently remembers him in thanksgiving.* Moreover, in 1726 the College obtained in the Court of King's Bench recognition as a Royal College, of which the Sovereign was a Visitor. Wherefore, if Alfred founded University College, accredited the oldest

* Nevertheless, the claim of University College to seniority is unchallengeable and can be established by a visit to the College Chapel. On the East Window is a representation of the Jettisoning of Jonah. On the stern of the ship from which he is being thrown is a flag. On the flag are the arms of University College, Oxford. Favete linguis.

at Oxford, how comes it that he is not recognised as founder of the University, unless, indeed, some founder unknown preceded him? Of a truth it would appear that there may even have been an earlier University College, for, in establishing its claim that the Monarch should be the Visitor, the College propounded that 'the noble saints,' St John of Beverley and Bede, were formerly members. Now, both these died before Alfred was born. Wherefore it is evident that University College is not only the oldest but the most remarkable institution of its kind in the country.

Cambridge have shown themselves not one whit behind in 'ring-craft.' Admitted that Alfred did found Oxford, he received his education at Cambridge, or at least near it, at a monastic school in the Isle of Ely. In any case, however, *qua* founder, Alfred is quite a late-comer. Cambridge was founded in the 4321st year from the Creation by a Spanish Prince, named Cantaber, who obtained the necessary Charters from King Arthur and Cadwallader, and was subsequently restored by Sigebert in 630 A.D. Unfortunately, these priceless documents, together with the Rules of Sergius and Honorius, perished in the raids of the Town on Corpus Christi College.

'Tis strange, but true, for truth is always strange,
Stranger than fiction,'

that these exalted Academies actually seem to have taken all this 'cobweb and fable' evidence seriously. In fact, the dispute on one occasion occupied the attention of Parliament under its most religious and gracious King—Charles II—at that time assembled. Parliament wilted before the prospective trouble and compromised on 'the two Universities,' and Box and Cox were satisfied. 'Thus we play the fools with the time, and the spirits of the wise sit in the clouds and mock us.'

To descend from these Olympian heights and the Wars of the Immortals to snap up unconsidered trifles. Within the grounds of Exeter College, Oxford, stands a fig-tree. Within the grounds of Trinity College, Cambridge, stands a fig-tree. One season the Oxford fig-tree produced an especially fine fig. One season the Cambridge fig-tree produced an especially fine fig. On the Oxford fig Doctor Kennicott, the famous Hebrew Scholar, hung

a label inscribed, 'Doctor Kennicott's fig.' On the Cambridge fig Doctor Monro, Professor of Latin, hung a label inscribed, 'Doctor Monro's fig.' An Oxford undergraduate 'conveyed' the Exeter fig and left in its place the legend, 'A fig for Doctor Kennicott.' A Cambridge undergraduate 'conveyed' the Trinity fig and left in its place the legend, 'A fig for Doctor Monro.' This coincidence proves beyond doubt that, whatever question there may be as to the seniority of the Sister Universities, their intelligence is dead level.

Both Universities are situate on the banks of a river with a name differing from that of the main stream of which it is portion—Oxford on the Isis, Cambridge on the Granta. The Isis is a short stretch of river sandwiched in between the upper and lower reaches of the Thames. Examination of Maps Ancient and Modern seems to indicate either that there was some early mistake in the topographical nomenclature or that the Granta has modestly retired upstream, leaving the Backs in possession of the Cam. The Granta, however, still retains its hold on the University in the title of the University Magazine, 'The Granta,' which has its counterpart in the Oxford 'Isis.'

At Queen's College, Oxford, a Boar's Head is intimately associated with the College. At the Queens' College, Cambridge, a Boar's Head is intimately associated with the College. At Oxford the Boar's Head is carried every Christmastide in procession from the kitchen to the High Table. At the head of its retinue march two serving-men, bearing the head on high. The College Choir follow, singing the following quaint chanty :

'A boar's head' in hand bring I,
Bedecked with bays and rosemary—
I pray you, my masters, be merry.
 Quot estis in convivio.
 Caput apri defero
 Reddens laudes domino.

'The boar's head, as I understand,
Is the rarest dish in all the land,
Which thus bedecked with gay garland
 Let us servire cantico.
 Caput apri defero, etc.

'Our steward hath provided this
 In honour of the King of Bliss
 Which on this day to be served is
 In Reginensi Atrio.
 Caput apri defero, etc.'

The first four lines of each stanza are sung as a solo. The chorus takes up the last two. At the Queens' College, Cambridge, the Boar's Head figures armorially, a memorial of Richard III, who was a liberal benefactor of the College. Nevertheless, the story of the Oxford Boar's Head, though barren of royal association, is not uninspiring. It commemorates a valorous achievement of a student, soon after the foundation of the College. 'The said student, walking in Shotover Forest, and diligently reading Aristotle, was suddenly attacked by a wild boar, that rushed at him out of a neighbouring thicket. The undaunted student was equal to the perilous occasion. He thrust his book into the boar's mouth, and effectually "choaked off" his adversary by this practical application of the arguments of the Stagyrte.'

Incidentally, the Queen's College, Oxford, was founded under the auspices of Philippa, Queen of Edward III. The Queens' College, Cambridge, owes its plural to having been founded by two queens, the first, Margaret of Anjou, consort of Henry VI; the second, her friend and erstwhile lady-in-waiting, Elizabeth Woodville, Queen of Edward IV. This foundation, the third, is, indeed, something of the nature of a labour of love. Elizabeth Woodville was much attached to Queen Margaret, and it is noteworthy that her first husband had fallen, fighting on the Lancastrian side, at the second battle of St Alban's. This was the third foundation, in fact, though the first and second might almost be reckoned as one. The original founder was one Andrew Docket, Rector of St Botolph's Church, and Principal of St Botolph's Hostel; his Charter was obtained in 1446, and the refoundation by Margaret of Anjou, at his request, dates from 1448.

The Queen's College and the Queens' College are sufficiently alike to be considered duplicates, as are Magdalen and Magdalene. Of the final 'e' in the latter Cambridge make a special point. Why, it is difficult to comprehend. Certainly the history of Magdalene is remarkable. It was successively the Monks' College of

Buckingham, a hostel called Bokyngham College, and in 1483 Buckingham College. After its surrender on the Dissolution of the Monasteries, it was refounded by Sir Thomas Audley, Lord Chancellor, Baron Audley of Walton, a creature of the Crown who had waxed exceeding rich on monastic spoil, and finally its Charter was signed by Philip and Mary. Each University also possesses a Trinity, St John's, Jesus, Pembroke and Corpus Christi College, of which Corpus Christi, Cambridge, is specially noteworthy as the one and only College at either University founded by the town.

For many years at five o'clock on May morning the Magdalen Choir at Oxford greets the dawn with a hymn beginning

‘To Thee, O God and Father—Thee,
All worship, praise, and glory be.’

Since 1902 a similar custom has obtained at St John's, Cambridge. On Ascension Day, after Morning Service the Choir ascends the Tower and sings Palestrina's ‘O Rex Gloriae.’ At Christ Church, Great Tom, the Great Bell of Oxford, rings at 9.5 p.m. 101 strokes, the number of the original students, plus one added, 1633, by the Thurston bequest. At St Mary the Great's Church, Cambridge, a bell is rung from 9 to 9.15 every evening, the concluding strokes repeating the number of the day of the month.

It is interesting, though not remarkable, that on the translation of Broadgates Hall into Pembroke College, Oxford, the last Master of Broadgates became the first Master of Pembroke, and that on the similar translation of a God's House for Students of Grammar into Christ's College, Cambridge, the last Proctor of the God's House became the first Master of Christ's. It is interesting and remarkable, even conspicuous, that two of the most famous features of the Universities owe their existence to the English Renaissance—Tom Tower at Oxford, and the Fountain in the Great Court of Trinity, Cambridge. The clapping of Tom Tower on to the Faire Gateway was an outrage, but it would be now an outrage to take it away. The Fountain has no business in its surroundings, but its removal would leave an inexcusable void. In contemplating these structures the feeling is that they should never

have been, but that, being as they are, they still should be. Moreover, each belongs to its own University, and its own University is proud of it.

These be but trifles due to an architectural reaction, a mere matter of taste. To the tremendous reality of the Black Death each University is indebted for a notable foundation—in order of priority, Cambridge for Trinity Hall, founded 1350; Oxford for New College, founded 1379. The earlier scheme, great and daring though it was, is less noble than the latter. William Bateman, Bishop of Norwich, was a militant Churchman of high temper and high intellect. William of Wykeham, Bishop of Winchester, twice Lord High Chancellor of England, was a great statesman. Bateman's design was to secure a training ground which would produce men thoroughly equipped for the service, the militant service of the Church. William of Wykeham's conception was a training ground for men thoroughly equipped for religion. Bateman was one of those uncompromising and somewhat unscrupulous champions of Church versus State, who 'troubled Israel' in the days of the Plantagenets. The gaps made in the ranks of the Clergy by the pestilence gave him an opportunity. He determined that those gaps should be filled by the right men—men who thought, or had been educated into thinking as he did. His aim was to found a school of trained logicians, who should further ultramontane interests—in fact, support the Papal authority against the Statutes of Præmunire and Provisors. The scheme, however, did not attract. Men looked askance at a College, founded by a Bishop, wherein theology and philosophy were neglected. Indeed, at the time of Bateman's death the Society numbered only the Master, three Fellows and three Scholars. William of Wykeham's object was to rectify two shortcomings, the one educational, the other ministerial. He recognised the mistake of cramming the whole of a youth's education into a short University career, and founded first Winchester College in Hampshire as a sort of Preparatory School, and then New College, Oxford, for the completion of the course. He saw also that the Clergy had been sorely reduced by the Black Death, and these two institutions were designed as a recruiting ground to make good the wastage. It was a great design, greatly executed. The union of the

Chapel and the Hall of New under one roof is emblematic of his conception.

Whilst on the subject of University building, it is worth while to find the answer to the familiar question—why are the College enclosures at Oxford called Quads, and those at Cambridge Courts? and how comes it that some of the Cambridge Courts are really Quads—quad-rangular? Precedence must be given to the Oxford Quad by virtue of seniority, albeit the history of the Cambridge Court is the more interesting. Merton, as a College, is the premier University foundation in England, the first great residential College in which students were lodged and incidentally subjected to supervision. It antedates Peterhouse, the senior Cambridge College, by ten years, and Christ's, the earliest existing Cambridge residential College, by two hundred and thirty-one.

What Hugh of Balsham, Bishop of Ely, would have done had he possessed Walter de Merton's wealth can only be conjectured. Certain it is that he adopted, generally, de Merton's statutes and followed as closely as might be in his footsteps, but there are indications that he was relatively straitened both in means and space. Consequently his designs found expression, and that after his death, only in that 'exceeding beautiful Hall' which stands to this day. This Hall or Home, like other early foundations at Cambridge, was designed for the Master and Fellows only, and provided for them, as in ordinary homes, sleeping-rooms, a dining-room, and, being an educational establishment, working-rooms. Also as in the case of other homes, the Familia went to worship at the nearest church. Of the pre-Reformation Colleges Michaelhouse, King's Hall (now both absorbed by Trinity), Clare, Corpus Christi, and Trinity Hall were all chapel-less. Some of these venerable institutions remained Halls till the middle of the last century, when the title was most properly amended to Colleges. Peterhouse and Trinity Hall retain their ancient names, Peterhouse perhaps through pride of heredity, and Trinity Hall for an obvious reason. Then, as funds increased and the necessity for finding accommodation for students and so forth matured, buildings, including chapels, were added to meet the requirements, and so came the development from the single range of building to two ranges at right

angles, and so on to the three-sided Court, culminating in some cases in the perfect quadrangle to which the original title of Court naturally clung. One of the results of this gradual development is that few, if any, of the Cambridge Dining Halls are large enough to accommodate the undergraduates of the College at one time. The same is true of the Chapels. Frequently there are two Halls before the College can be fed. Trinity demands no less than three. Whether there are a corresponding number of Chapels is the business of the Society. Oxford is better off in this respect, though there, as at Cambridge, a considerable proportion of the undergraduates have to live out.

Christ's, founded 1505, was the first Cambridge College to which students were admitted as members of a College as well as the University, and subjected to College discipline. This development had, however, been anticipated by Edward III in 1336, in the form of The House of the Scholars of the King, or the King's House, subsequently, as stated, absorbed by Trinity. Trinity is the pluralist of the Universities. It embraces under one foundation Michaelhouse, King's Hall, Gregory's, Crouched, St Margaret's, St Katherine's, Tyld or Tyler's, Gerrard's or Garret, and Physwick Hostels, and Ovyng's Inn. It is almost unnecessary to say that it has a counterpart, though a minor counterpart, at Oxford in Brasenose, which includes Little University, Brasenose, Haberdashers', Little St Edmund and Salisbury Halls, with Glass House and Stable Halls; but of these the two last must be disallowed as not having stood on the present site, and the mere change of name from Brasenose Hall to Brasenose College cannot be recognised as constituting a separate foundation in this relation.

To touch on the stormy question of the Dissolution of the Monasteries is always rash, and is moreover outside the scope of this article. Nevertheless, it is permissible to record sundry curious and instructive indications of the coming tempest which touched both Cambridge and Oxford, and which show that the Dissolution did not strike like a bolt from the blue, and that there were men of understanding who could read the signs of the times. Quite early in the reign of Henry VI, after the Maid of Orleans had inspired the valour of France with triumphant

confidence, it became more and more evident that we were losing our hold on that fair country, never to regain it. Now, all over England were 'cells' of great foreign Abbeys, Cluny and others, and these paid the greater proportion of their revenues to the parent institutions. Accordingly, it also became evident that the payment of such moneys to an enemy country was not sound national finance. True it is that Henry V (and this is noteworthy) had temporarily commandeered such sums; but that was only to establish himself in what he regarded as his joint realm. Henry VI permanently appropriated them to the building of Eton and King's Colleges and like institutions. An English monarch, in fact, seized on Church property and applied it to his own chosen uses, and that, too, backed by a Bull from the Pope, dated Jan. 31, 1448. This gives curiously to think what might have happened to the Monasteries had Henry VIII remained Defender of the Faith and Ally of the Pope, in the event of a substantial agreement having been arrived at between the High Contracting Parties.

Later, in 1516-17, the College of Corpus Christi was founded by Richard Foxe. Like William of Wykeham, founder of New College, Foxe was a man of extraordinary abilities. 'Prelate'—like William of Wykeham, he was Bishop of Winchester—'statesman, architect, soldier, herald and diplomatist, he appears to have combined remarkable powers and capacity.' It is, therefore, extraordinary that a man who was co-counsellor to the Crown with Archbishop Morton, and must have been cognisant of that Primate's charge to the Abbot of St Alban's, and possibly other documents not less compromising, should have contemplated the founding of a monastery. On this point he was set right by his friend, Bishop Oldham, who remonstrated on the futility of a foundation for 'bussing' monks, 'whose end and fall we may live to see.' Indeed, to those who had foresight, nothing short of a miracle (or of reformation from within which would have been of the nature of a miracle) could have saved the monasteries for long, no matter who sat on the throne, though admittedly the besom of destruction did fall into the hands of a ruthless sweeper. Later again, in 1522, Wolsey 'induced' the Prior of the Convent of St Frideswide at Oxford to surrender that establish-

ment into the hands of the King. There is a subtle anticipatory suggestion of 'perwailed on him to stop' in the word 'induced,' inasmuch as more than forty religious institutions were suppressed to form the endowments of Christ Church. Something more than 'cat's-paws' on the water, these!

Parallels, counterparts, and similarities may be found right and left, attributable to the similarity in development and constitution of the two Universities. Only one of these will be here noticed. In estimating the influence of Oxford and Cambridge, the tendency is to recall the clarion roll of names of Scholars, Prelates, Statesmen, Reformers, Missionaries, Men of Science, Men of Art and so forth, but to overlook those who have not fallen far short of attaining fame, 'with thousands of others close on their heels, those 'who have no memorial,' yet the noblest similarity of all. Every year men go out from the Universities, carrying on them, if they be worthy, the seal of the Universities, and permeate the Empire with their high tradition, *monumentum ære perennius*.

CLAUDE E. BENSON.

Art. 4.—EDUCATION AND THE FILM.

1. *Towards a New Education*. Edited by William Boyd, with an introduction by Sir Michael Sadler. Knopf, 1930.
2. *Day Schools of England*. By Ronald Gurner. Dent, 1930.

IN one of those moments of discouragement which come to all whose eyes are set upon an ideal, the late Lord Haldane lamented that as a nation we paid lip-service to education, and little else. Certain it is that for the last twelve years at least there has been a huge deal of talk about education, and sometimes it has to be admitted that those who talk loudest and longest about it are by no means always the best instructed. It is a curious truth that every citizen—every rate-payer at all events—considers himself fully qualified to express an opinion, often decided, upon a subject which not merely has infinite variety, but also has been a source of perplexity and dissension to some of the profoundest minds of the past. Talk there is in abundance, and it is now revived, indeed liberated afresh, by the introduction of another Education Bill, already a matter of much controversy. It is hardly possible to go anywhere, even to circles widely removed from political fervour, without being involved in a discussion on the merits and demerits of raising the school age. But there is never smoke and no vestige of fire. In spite of the prevalence of much uninstructed talk, more genuine interest is taken, both publicly and privately, in educational affairs to-day than ever before in our history. They touch more lives, their value is more clearly recognised.

The interest is welcomed by all who care for progress—and yet progress in education, as apart from progress in educational administration, must at all times be slow. Administration changes continually, it widens, it 'broadens down from precedent to precedent,' it makes its mistakes and its developments: but education, though subject also to change, is far less mobile. Mr Boyd has collected in his many-paged volume a mass of opinion and experience given in the Fifth International Conference of the New Education Fellowship in August 1929,

and it is interesting reading for students, but the degree to which all the new experiments and ideas therein recorded are influencing the world is unknown. We do not need to be as cynical as Gibbon, who remarked of Commodus, 'the power of instruction is seldom of much efficacy except in those happy dispositions where it is almost superfluous,' but we are still disturbingly confronted with the child who, in spite of all the various plans and methods of recent times, does not succeed at school and yet makes a success of his life, and with the even more exasperating pupil who is a prodigy at school and a failure in his profession. As far as these two classes of children are concerned, the old methods leave one irresistibly with the sense of unfulfilment. By their fruits must all things be judged, and these two classes are sufficiently large to keep us from contented passivity.

New Education Fellowship—the words have about them a most attractive ring: 'fellowship' is one of the most beautiful words in the language and 'education' one of the most profound; but 'new'? In what sense can education be said to be new? Was it entitled to that expansive epithet even as long ago as the days of Plato? Let us see what one of those solid, sensible Englishmen, whose views have such influence with us in our present troubled times, has to say about it: 'Education is as well known, and has long been as well known, as ever it can be.' Nothing evasive or diffident in such an opinion. We need not be surprised: it is not a dictum of to-day. It is the dictum of Dr Samuel Johnson, spoken in 1775.

Most people, whether they are actually engaged in teaching or are merely interested in it, may feel, on first having that saying recalled to their attention, that it is but one more instance of Johnson's dogmatism. It is that indubitably, but nevertheless there is about it still a certain reality. For hundreds, indeed thousands, of years before 1775, earnest and capable thinkers had been studying education: there is some excuse for Johnson. And yet now we recognise—the recognition is inherent in all our recent experiments—that it is not as well known as it can be, and even that in all human probability it never will reach that static elevation. The reason can only be that we no longer think as sectionally as was once our wont: we are returning to a knowledge possessed

by the ancient world and declared by Plato in the words, 'Education and admonition commence in the first years of childhood and last to the very end of life.' We admit now that no one is too young and no one is too old to learn; in other words, that education is not a limited business suited only to certain subjects and certain ages, but is a preparation for the art of living and even the art of living itself.

Education has undergone many changes since the harsh crudities of 1775, and as for the art of living, though it might well be maintained that that is the one thing that in its dependence upon the human spirit is unchangeable, at any rate it has now to be exercised in a world wholly different from that of 1775. The art of living may be the same, but life has been transformed almost out of recognition by our ancestors. It is in this new world of science, mechanics, and inventions of every description that we all have to try to exercise the art, if we can, and the products of our schools amongst us. It is no doubt in some degree easier for them: they have not to assimilate themselves, as the older generations need to do, to the age in which they find themselves. They do not need to forget ways suitable to slower, quieter times. They cannot imagine the world as it was without motor-cars, the telephone, the gramophone, broadcasting, and the like: to that extent their lives are easier than those of the man who in boyhood drove behind a horse, and their mentality is not the same.

So far, in spite of all the developments and changes both in educational theory and in practice, the influence of this new world upon our schools has in the main been only indirect. But we are now at the beginning of a fresh phase in the ever-moving story. Little by little pressure is increasing, and it is difficult to estimate how far it should be gainsaid. The schoolmaster who first made use of printed books in his class was an innovator of no uncertain kind: the invention of the typewriter added a new subject to the specialised curriculum for those about to take up a commercial career. And now we have knocking at the doors and beginning to clamour for admittance insistently and often, it must be admitted, very ignorantly a host of new devices of which the gramophone, the film, and wireless are the most conspicuous.

We have come—and the fact must be faced, whether we welcome or deplore it—to a period of human knowledge when many things that would have been utterly incredible to our forefathers are matters of ordinary everyday experience to our children. Not merely can sounds be recorded and reproduced with exactitude, but so can motions. Not only can Time be rendered of no effect by the portrayal of scenes and the repetition of words which were performed and said in the past, but even Space now undergoes annihilation when by means of the televisior a man can not merely be heard, as in broadcasting, when he is not present in the flesh before his audience, but can also be seen as he speaks in the distant studio. To express in the least adequately something of the wonders that scientific invention is now making possible of enactment in our midst, one can only fall back upon the definition of a schoolboy who described the imperfect tense as being ‘used in French to express a future action in past time which does not take place at all.’

These inventions and devices are facts, and it is in these and similar facts of modern life that the growing generation is so greatly interested. It is true that many of them are as yet imperfect, but they are young, some indeed in extreme infancy, and nothing is more certain than that they will be improved, in the years that lie immediately ahead of us, out of all recognition. What every one interested in or concerned with education should therefore be asking is: what is going to be their bearing upon educational method? how far is it possible, and, still more, how far is it advisable, to bring them into the service of the schools? Nothing is of less use to educational advance than the easy closing of the mind to new inventions; and an educationist ought inherently to be curious to desire to investigate possibilities. He or she cannot be really interested in the great work of teaching without being also interested in Life, and yet, ironically enough, novelties make their way with unusual slowness into our schools. And the reason is not by any means entirely financial, though finance governs that world with strictness. But the reluctance to investigate and experiment is passing. The power of the film, its broad appeal to and influence upon the minds of millions, both young

and old, has become too obvious to be ignored; and other older, and in some respects simpler, mechanical devices are being increasingly used for instructional purposes of a special character. For example, the advantage of a gramophone record, tirelessly and faultlessly repeating phrases of a foreign language, can be readily appreciated by a language master who is rarely faultless and never tireless. Records are being used by language learners to-day and with success; but the film, so much more versatile and with such infinitely great possibilities, has hardly begun its conquest. Here and there throughout England a few enthusiasts are employing it, but no serious attempt has yet really been made to harness its powers to the service of education, and whilst it has been waiting outside the doors it has added to itself speech and penalised our language by the birth of the odious word 'talkie.'

A number of inquiries have taken place and are continuing, but all were and are tentative and productive of little result. A landmark of a minor character occurred in September last, when an Exhibition, entitled one of Mechanical Aids to Learning, was organised by the British Institute of Adult Education, and held at the London School of Economics: at this I was invited to give the opening address. This exhibition was of real interest in that it was the first of the kind ever held in any country, and many and wonderful were the devices exhibited. It at any rate served the purpose of allowing all who visited it to see for themselves what science was offering for their assistance and to form their own opinion, not only of what actually existed, but also of what was speedily coming into being. The net result was perhaps not entirely encouraging to the promoters: devices already familiar, such as the gramophone for language records and improvements in the old magic-lantern and the epidiascope were welcomed, but the wonders of the world of the film and the televisior proved rather disappointing. In the main it was the same story as I had found six years before when I was asked by the Imperial Education Conference to gather together a committee to investigate the uses of the film in education and report to the next Conference. Science had progressed, new inventions had come and were coming into being, but the mating between

this new creation and the old world of education was still hopelessly incomplete.

In 1924 my committee had consisted half of educationists and half of men of the film world: it was hoped that the first would tell the second what they required for practical use in schools, and that the second would tell the first what they could achieve in the studio to meet those requirements. Those hopes were doomed to failure. Few educationists at that time—and not many since—could say what they really required, and no film magnate was willing to be instructed. The educationist was not sure that he required anything, the film magnate was sure that what he was then creating was what the educationist ought to require. The first was not concerned with commercial profit, the second was not concerned with anything else, and neither was ready to learn from the other. Again and again those interested in the production of films showed me examples of what they wished to dispose of to our schools, and pressed me to say that they were 'educational.' Few things are not educational in one respect or other. Certainly a film showing, for example, a traveller in Morocco can be so described without injury to truth; but, as it was necessary repeatedly (and quite uselessly) to explain to the producer, that did not of itself make it of practical use to schools; it did no more than justify it as a Saturday evening entertainment of an interesting and instructive kind, in a school that could afford the luxury. Similarly, a change being made from geography to history, I recollect being shown a film of the Tower of London wherein the only moving object was the sentry pacing up and down. An equal effect from a purely educational point of view could have been obtained at infinitely less cost from an ordinary magic-lantern.

The Exhibition of Mechanical Aids to Learning, of September 1930, suffered in like manner. The scientists with minds bent upon their marvellous inventions, the members of film companies with theirs bent upon commercial expansion undeniably produced strange and startling results: they gave visitors admirable films of people talking and speaking, they made Time and Space ridiculous, but they did not prove the essential value of such inventions to educational practice—for the same

reason as in 1924. The two minds, those of the educationist and the film magnate, are still a little contemptuous one of the other. The latter is still convinced that he knows best what the educationist ought to want; and the educationist is still not only unconvinced that he has now at his hand devices which can greatly assist him in his task of teaching, but also is made afraid by the extravagant claims advanced on behalf of these devices. He has heard enthusiasts declare that soon there will be no more need for teachers, only for ushers to keep order whilst a lesson is broadcast from a central studio or a film universally shown, and, though he knows that to be arrant nonsense, still he remembers what happened to the hand-weavers when machinery was introduced. And the more sensational press adds to his uneasiness. A definite example occurred in September. An evening journal asked me for a précis of my intended remarks, so that it might have a due report on the day of the opening of the Exhibition. I had no précis, but I gave the reporter a verbal summary of what I proposed to say, laying particular stress upon the name of the exhibition and stating that it was above all things essential, if teachers were not to be discouraged from attending, to emphasise that mechanical aids, however interesting or valuable, could never supplant the human agency and influence. The evening journal report was headed in large type, 'Talkies may oust the Teachers,' and the subsequent paragraphs were arranged with such deft lack of accuracy that no reader could possibly tell which was comment by the reporter and which was paraphrase of my remarks. In the interests of the Exhibition I asked for an immediate correction, but of course without avail. Except only that the foolish and sensational headline voiced the fear latent in the minds of many teachers, the incident would possess no importance: nearly all who have ever made a public utterance have suffered similar perversions, though perhaps few so diametrically direct, and I found no teacher who believed I had said anything of the sort.

The basic fact, however, remains: there is still an unbridged gap between the minds of the film-maker and the teacher. No film-maker yet, of whom at least I have any knowledge, has really studied the problem of the creation of educational films with expert educational

advice. The difficulties are not easily to be overcome, since no one naturally can be expected to make a film unless he can 'win out' on the whole transaction with a profit, and schools are not yet equipped in readiness nor have they money to spare for experiments. But it is not easy to see how any advance can be expected until the two things, the actual capabilities of the film and the actual needs of the curriculum are closely and expertly correlated. The English Association, at the request of the B.B.C., has recently been trying to investigate the extent to which our schools are making use of broadcasting in the teaching of English and the utility and future thereof generally. That is valuable, even though the answers to the Association's questionnaire reveal much less material for the formation of a judgment than had been hoped. The problem, both in respect of broadcasting and of the film, is not the simple one that it appears to those without knowledge of education or of our schools. The curriculum is already crowded, not only in the day schools of which Mr Ronald Gurner writes, but in all schools: new methods cannot be merely superimposed. And it is as yet far from clearly established to what degree, if any, instruction by means of the film, even if the suitable film were in existence, can be a substitute for or an improvement on the older form of lesson.

As far as the rather meagre evidence at present extends, it would seem doubtful whether there is any very great assistance to be derived from the use of films in the teaching of history, English, or geography. Historical films are always very costly and usually absurdly inaccurate, except perhaps as to costumes; films illustrative of our English classics normally move a lover of literature to tears, and geography does not require motion. In the first and third certainly, and occasionally under cultured supervision the second, a sense of atmosphere and interest can undoubtedly be aroused by the visual representation in picturesque guise; but it is hard to see how the use of the film in these categories can ever be more than an educational luxury, providing an instructive hour additional altogether to the regular work of the school. It is in such subjects as nature study and science that it is certain, in my judgment, that the film can become an invaluable assistant.

Processes taking days or months or years can be ocularly demonstrated, and also important scientific experiments, though here a caution should be uttered as to the undesirability of showing by means of a film what a master could actually and verbally demonstrate in person before his class. We have still to investigate more scientifically and on a broader basis than has yet been attempted the proper way in which to use the new ally. Speaking of broadcasting, one educational expert is doubtful 'if more can be done than implant the seed of interest': that is the aim of all education, and if that can be done the rest follows. But there is many a snare yet to be located and avoided. A child seeing a film may receive its instruction passively, and even in this age of ideas as to freedom mental effort is essential to progress. And, furthermore, a child does not see what an adult sees. A well-known clergyman, much interested in the best use of the film, used to illustrate this truth by a story within his own experience. He told how he was trying to interest his little son in the story of Our Lord by showing him pictures, and one was of the Baby in the manger: after hearing the tale and studying the picture, the boy remarked, to the discomfiture of his parent, that much trouble would be caused if 'the cock bit the baby Jesus.' The father looked again, and then for the first time observed the figure of a cock shown close to the manger. To him that had been too unimportant for notice, to the child it was the central feature. It is certain that merely to show films, however admirable, to children would be to court similarly unexpected results: close collaboration between the teacher, the lesson, and the visual demonstration is absolutely essential, and as yet that has hardly begun.

These are some of the difficulties, and it is necessary to face them. It is of no avail simply to turn one's back on this new and pushful creation of man's mechanical invention. Sir Benjamin Gott had the true vision when he spoke of the necessity for building all new schools suitably for the reception of the equipment of the future. These things—the film, the wireless, and all the rest of the scientific wonders—are with us in our life and cannot be utterly excluded from our schools, or our schools fail demonstrably in equipping their products for life. And the older the product the more useful the equipment

becomes. It is not without significance that it was the British Institute for Adult Education which organised the September Exhibition, and the English Association which has so recently been investigating the use of broadcasting in teaching. For adults the advantages of these devices are obvious: home studies become possible that before were beyond reality, and millions—*glebae ascripti*, even as the serfs of old—have had the outer world brought to their minds through their eyes in a manner undreamed of by their fathers.

We may leave this vexed and yet most interesting and important subject of the true use of the film in our schools with the general comment that it is all so new that it has not yet been determined with any clearness or authority, that it must be taken more and more into account, and that it can never be elevated into a higher position than that of adjunct or at best ally of the human teacher, and pass to a brief consideration of the still wider subject, the educative influence of the film generally. Young as the film is, there is no one now who attempts to dispute its power. In spite of the hyperbole that seems inseparable from the language of its devotees, the ridiculous abuse of the prefix 'super,' and the extravagant and indeed irrelevant announcement of the sums expended on individual productions, it is difficult to deny that, for better or worse, the film has leapt now into priority over all the other educative forces of the world. Upon its promoters lies a weight of responsibility for human thought and action which at present they are very far indeed from being able adequately to bear. Millions of pounds are indeed spent upon it, as we are so frequently reminded; vast labour and ingenuity are devoted to it; on the technical side it has made rapid and enormous strides until praise without reservation can constantly be given to its photographic triumphs; and now the improvement of the production of sounds and of their synchronisation with movement proceeds apace. But the money, the labour, the ingenuity, and the technical achievements are still for the most part poured out in the endeavour to make stuff, in itself essentially feeble and tasteless, if not positively harmful, interesting or amusing to the public. And it is only here and there among the numbers engaged upon this new art that a

man can be found with both vision to dream and culture to try and realise the possibilities now lying to his hand.

That would be a cause for melancholy if it were not applicable to an art which, for all its growth, is still in its infancy. Crudities are inevitable in youth, in that of industries or arts as in that of humanity; and the film is both an industry and an art, much more the former than the latter as yet. There are signs that that is changing. The public are not quite such poor critics as producers often seem to think, and governments also are awakening to the power in their midst. We may confidently expect as radical a transformation, slow though it may be, as gave us the Elizabethan drama in place of the Morality Plays. Broadcasting, even more of a juvenile in the world, has in this matter of right influences set a notable example to its sister: its governors have been much quicker to appreciate that it has not been born into the modern world solely for the purposes of amusement, though that in its best sense must always be its foremost appeal. It is, in this age more than any other, impossible to guess other than very generally at the developments of the future. We may expect to see the combination of these two powers—the transmission of sight and of sound—develop until it is within the power of every householder, sitting at home in front of his whitened wall, to turn on for his amusement or instruction, or both, not merely as now the voices of the world, but their speakers, to see portrayed and to hear performed before him lectures, music, plays, whatsoever he will. To some this is a disturbing thought, just as in the days of the great John Ridd it was disturbing to him to see on his visit to London Lorna Doone ring a bell that sounded in her handmaiden's ears in another and distant room: to others it will be encouraging, a case of that 'infinite riches in a little room' which we already enjoy less extensively, but still miraculously, when we listen to Berlin on the wireless or see foreign lands or great events brought before us in the local cinema. This is all a breaking down of isolation, a broadening of understanding that is an offset even to the most sensitive, against the hideous noises and spreading ugliness of the strange world in which we now live.

It would be outside the scope of this article to speak
Vol. 256.—No. 507.

of the Americanisation of our language which, under the influence of the 'captions' of the films, is so marked a feature of to-day. That alone would prove the educative power of the new creation: education, it cannot be too often repeated, is coterminous with life, it goes on as we go on, if not for good, then for evil. But much as some of the influences of this many-headed creature may be deplored, it does not seem possible to doubt the extent of the good it has already, even in its crude youth, effected in the world. It may give false values, it may encourage extravagance to uneducated audiences, to youthful and unsophisticated minds, and in uncivilised countries the harm it may do is very real,—that cannot be doubted, and it is depressing for the British to find themselves constantly exhibited pictorially as idiots outwitted by cleverer heroes of Transatlantic nationality, and to see their ordinary home life held up to the mentality of all as consisting in a ludicrous mixture of crime and dissolute night-clubs. These are great evils, but nevertheless, when everything has been weighed on that side, and when the film is viewed in all its aspects as it is in all countries to-day, it is evident that it has already become a valuable servant of mankind, bringing glimmerings at least of knowledge where before was ignorance, replacing indifference by interest, and apart altogether from its great task of adding to human enjoyment, enriching the forces which are slowly making for the harmony and co-operation of the nations of the world.

GORELL.

Art. 5.—THE ROYAL DUBLIN SOCIETY AND ITS BICENTENARY.

THE Royal Dublin Society, which is still, as it was in the eighteenth century, the 'most important sign of public spirit in Ireland,'* celebrates this year its bicentenary. The event is of interest, not only to students of Irish politics and economics, but to scientists and philosophers as well. The origins of the Society may really be said to go back to Bacon and his definitions that 'knowledge is power,' and its end the 'improvement of man's estate.' At the close of the seventeenth century Scholasticism was still influential in Trinity College, the chief seat of learning in Ireland; where also the work of the modern continental philosophers, Descartes, Malebranche, and Leibnitz, was well known. But the great and fashionable novelty in the intellectual life of Dublin was the spirit of experimental inquiry summed up by John Locke, who was of Bacon's line. Trinity preceded both Oxford and Cambridge in putting Locke among the classics. Locke's strong penetration into Dublin seems to have been due very largely to two remarkable brothers, the sons of an English engineer who had settled in Ireland in the early part of the seventeenth century. They were William and Thomas (afterwards Sir Thomas) Molyneux. William Molyneux, 'that very ingenious and studious promoter of real knowledge,'† entered Trinity College in 1670, and a few years later, when in correspondence with Locke, founded a Dublin Philosophical Society, the aims of which were similar to those of the Royal Society of London.‡ Its President was Sir William Petty, the economist, an ancestor of the Lansdowne family. It published scientific papers, and owned a Botanic Garden, a Museum, and a Laboratory. The Society broke up during the Irish Civil War which followed the deposition of King James II; but it was revived

* Lecky, 'Ireland in the Eighteenth Century,' vol. i, p. 297.

† As Locke described him in the second edition of the 'Essay Concerning the Human Understanding,' book ii, ch. 9, § 8.

‡ See the 'Familiar Letters of John Locke,' which contain several references to the Dublin Philosophical Society. William Molyneux was the author of a 'Treatise on Dioptries,' which influenced both Locke and Berkeley.

after the revolutionary settlement, in 1693, and may be properly called the embryonic form of the Dublin (afterwards the Royal Dublin) Society which fourteen Irishmen in a day in June 1731 met to establish, their venue being the rooms of the Philosophical Society in Trinity College, and their purpose 'the improvement of husbandry, manufactures, and other useful arts.'

William Molyneux was no longer living in 1731; but his brother, Sir Thomas Molyneux, a man of distinguished scientific attainments and described as the greatest authority on the natural history of Ireland, was present at the formation of the new body, with the following thirteen: Judge Ward, Thomas Upton, John Pratt, Richard Warburton, the Rev. Dr Whitcomb, Arthur Dobs, Dr Stephens, Dr Magentis, Dr John Madden, Mr Le Hunte, Mr Walton, Mr Prior, and Mr Maple. Of a few of these biographical details can yet be traced. Ward came from the Co. Armagh and was a Judge of the King's Bench. Richard Warburton had been educated at Eton and was LL.D. of Trinity College. Walton, it seems probable, was the Dublin schoolmaster of that name who later took part in a famous mathematical controversy occasioned by Bishop Berkeley's attack on Newtonian principles.* Prior, first secretary of the Society, came from Rathdowney in the Queen's County. Maple, author of 'A Method of Tanning without Bark,' became curator and registrar of the new institution, and died at the age of 104. He had been a chemist and operator in chemistry to the University, and was associated with Swift in the agitation over Wood's halfpence. Dr John Madden was the father of the Samuel Madden who, though not, as stated by both Lecky and the 'Dictionary of National Biography,' an original member of the Society, became its munificent supporter and played a large part in directing its early policy.

At a second meeting, held in December 1731, a set of rules was drawn up, and the part was clearly defined which the Society was to play in the history of Ireland during the remainder of the eighteenth century. Lecky has summarised its role in this period:

* In reply to Berkeley's criticisms a Mr Walton of Dublin, a professor and mathematician, offered in 1735 'A Vindication of Sir Isaac Newton's Fluxions.'

'It attracted to itself a considerable number of able and public-spirited members, and it was resolved that each member, on his admission, should select some particular branch, either of natural history, husbandry, gardening, or manufacture; should endeavour as far as possible to make himself a complete master of all that was known concerning it; and should draw up a report on the subject. The chief object of the Society was as far as possible to correct the extreme ignorance of what was going on in these departments in other countries which, owing to poverty, to want of education, or enterprise, and to the isolated geographical position of the country, was very general. The Society published a weekly account of its proceedings, collected statistics, popularised new inventions, encouraged by premiums agricultural improvements and different forms of Irish industry, brought over from England a skilful farmer to give lessons in his art, set up a model farm and even model manufactories, and endeavoured as far as possible to diffuse industrial knowledge through the kingdom. The press cordially assisted it, and for some years there was scarcely a number of a Dublin newspaper that did not contain addresses from the Society with useful receipts or directions for farmers, or explanations of different branches of industry, and at the same time offers of small prizes for those who most successfully followed the instructions that were given. Thus—to give but a few out of very many instances—we find prizes offered for the best imitation of several kinds of foreign lace; for the best pieces of flowered silk, of damask, of tapestry, of wrought velvet; for the farmers who could show the largest amount of land sown with several specified kinds of seed, or manured with particular kinds of manure; for draining, for reclaiming unprofitable bogs, for the manufacture of cider, of gooseberry wine, and of beer brewed from Irish hops; for the best beaver hats made in the country; for the baker who baked bread or the fisherman who cured fish according to receipts published by the Society; for every cod crimped in the method that was in use in England and Holland, which was brought on a certain day to the market on Ormond Quay.'

The Dublin Society was the first public institution in these Islands to undertake the encouragement of art. It collected models, assisted poor artists, and held annual exhibitions. George Barrett and Hone, two of the founders of the Royal Academy in London, were educated in its School.

Of the early members of the Society, two especially—Thomas Prior and Samuel Madden—deserve to be remembered. In 1698, 1700, and 1705 respectively, three students, Thomas Prior, George Berkeley, and Samuel Madden, had entered Trinity College, and there with youthful enthusiasm had concerned themselves with all sorts of plans for the improvement of their country. Prior and Berkeley had been schoolfellows at the famous College in Kilkenny founded in 1558 and still surviving—it used to be called the Eton of Ireland—where Swift too had been taught; and they remained friends until death. Prior's correspondence is one of the chief sources of our knowledge of the Irish philosopher's life. His own life was one of ardent service; first came the interests of his country, then those of his friends, chiefly of them Berkeley the philosopher.* Being of a delicate constitution, Prior, instead of entering a profession, devoted himself to a study of the national resources, collecting the statistics of eighty native industries and acquiring an unrivalled knowledge of husbandry in Ireland. Madden, whose mother was the sister of William and Sir Thomas Molyneux, succeeded to family estates in Fermanagh in 1703, and was subsequently ordained, and when Rector of Drumroe in Northern Ireland, had the famous Skelton as his curate. Dr Johnson described him as a man whom Ireland should delight to honour; Arthur Young, in his 'Tour of Ireland,' spoke of him in similar terms. His membership of the Dublin Society dated from 1733; three years previously he had set out a scheme for the encouragement of learning at Trinity by a system of premiums, and now he proposed that the same system should be employed for the improvement of Irish farming—a policy which the Society successfully adopted, as it did also his plans for increasing its funds by laying 'persons of fortune' under contribution (he was himself the most generous of such persons) and securing a Royal Charter. His chief literary work was his 'Reflection and Resolutions proper for the Gentlemen of Ireland as to their Conduct for the Service of their Country.'

* He aided, for instance, in the administration of Esther Vanhomrigh's Will (the 'Vanessa' of Swift), who had made Berkeley one of her heirs and executors.

Neither Swift nor Berkeley, the two greatest figures of contemporary Ireland, became a member of the Dublin Society, though both must have been in sympathy with its objects. Berkeley had certainly an important, if indirect, influence on its foundation and development. In 1705, with Madden, Prior, and a few others, he had formed a Society in Trinity College to discuss 'some part of the new philosophy'; and the Statutes of this Society are preserved to this day and form a page of what has been described as one of the most important documents in the history of thought, Berkeley's 'Commonplace Book,'* which records the famous discovery of the non-existence of matter. Neither Prior nor Madden had metaphysical talent; but, on the other hand, Berkeley shared their interest in practical affairs and their zeal of patriotism, and his two chief motives in philosophising—so he stated in the entries of his 'Commonplace Book'—were first 'devotion to a practicable good,' and secondly, 'to see if others think as do we Irishmen.' Berkeley was to be the metaphysician of the new Ireland; Madden, her economist; Prior, her statistician; Molyneux, who had advocated the independence of the Irish Parliament, her political philosopher. In the year, however, that the Dublin Society was founded Berkeley was in New England, engaged on a famous mission of romantic philanthropy, and when he returned to his own country in 1734, it was to go as Bishop to the remote diocese of Cloyne in the South of Ireland. He never again lived in Dublin. But from his distant retreat he continued to follow the patriotic efforts of Madden and Prior with deep interest, and both his famous economic tract, 'The Querist,' and the medical part of his last philosophical work, 'Siris,' aimed at encouraging the spirit which had manifested itself in the foundation of 1731. Madden edited the 'Querist' when it appeared anonymously in 1735, and Prior had a great share in inducing the public to accept the Bishop's views set out in 'Siris' as to the value of tar as a panacea.† Prior communicated

* The manuscript of the 'Commonplace Book' is in the British Museum.

† Berkeley's 'Siris,' says the late Dr Fraser ('Berkeley's Life and Letters'), proclaimed the discovery of a universal medicine in tar-water, giving it a divine physical meaning and making it the first link in a series

many cases of supposed cures to the 'Dublin Journal' and the 'Gentleman's Magazine,' and in 1746 wrote a large work entitled 'An Authentic Narrative of the Success of Tar-water,' in which he published Berkeley's letters on the subject to himself. The noble and disinterested life of the first registrar of the Dublin Society closed on Oct. 21, 1751, and the Council erected a monument to him by Van Nost in Christ Church Cathedral, Dublin. Berkeley wrote the Latin inscription, still to be seen in the south porch, styling his friend, 'Societatis Dubliniensis, senator, institutor, curator.'

Other men of note who became members of the Society in its earliest years included Francis Bindon, a portrait-painter and the architect of some of the most famous Irish houses; Henry Brooke, author of the 'Fool of Quality,' and first editor of the 'Freeman's Journal'; Thomas Sheridan, the author of the 'Remarks on the Life and the Writings of Jonathan Swift'; and Dean Delany, Swift's vindicator. These names, except the last, like those of the original founders of the Society, belonged to families of the new Protestant aristocracy; and the Royal Dublin Society must be described, as to its origins at least, as an institution of the Ascendancy or as, in an unsatisfactory term, Anglo-Irish.* The old Irish and old English aristocracies had perished in the Stuart cause, or were in exile on the Continent. The native peasantry were kept down by the cruel Penal Laws. Catholic landlords were very few. It is not surprising, therefore, that a Society which drew its support from the landed classes and from a University the doors of which were closed to the Catholics, should have been representative chiefly of the newer interests. The Protestant Anglo-Irish were themselves bitterly divided in the eighteenth century into an 'Irish interest,' a patriot party, and an English interest; but both 'interests' were represented in the Dublin Society, and worked harmoniously there, thus foreshadowing the

of speculations which led to the Trinity. The work created an extraordinary sensation, not because of its metaphysical thought, but because it offered a Catholic remedy for the diseases of mankind.

* Unsatisfactory because the new Williamite landlords learned many Irish characteristics from the old Cromwellians, as the Cromwellians had learned them from the Catholics and Royalists.

success with which the Society, almost unique in this respect among Irish enterprises, has avoided shipwreck on the rock of politics. Public spirit in the Ireland of two hundred years ago was not confined, any more than it has been in modern times, to any one party; and the Dublin Society was the expression of existing public spirit, and not of particular opinions. Yet it is surprising that a country situated as Ireland was in 1731 should have given birth to an institution which was to be the precursor of all similar institutions in Europe. As Lecky observes, contrasts in Ireland are always strong; and 'it would be a grave error to suppose that in the first half of the eighteenth century everything in Ireland was frivolous and corrupt.' The two greatest of modern Irishmen, Swift and Berkeley, had been lately at the height of their influence. The school education of the Protestant minority was good; and Trinity College was, as we have seen, abreast of all the latest developments in science and in philosophy. Its Provost in 1709, Browne, was, like King, the Archbishop of Dublin, a thinker of European repute. Indeed, the thirty years preceding the establishment of the Dublin Society were, intellectually, the most distinguished that the Irish capital (and with it the 'English in Ireland') had ever known. They compare, in this respect, most favourably with the most celebrated epoch of Flood, Grattan, Burke, and the rhetoricians of Grattan's Parliament of 1782, although by that date—and largely through the educative propaganda of the Society*—Dublin had become a city of magnificent classical buildings, and the large cabins in which the gentry lived in 1731 had been replaced by noble country houses often full of the finest treasures of art.

In obtaining a Charter in 1750, Madden acted against the opinion of a Viceroy so well disposed towards Ireland as Lord Chesterfield, who feared that as soon as there were 'employments to dispose of,' the Society would lose its usefulness and sink to an 'object of party.' Fortunately, the Charter was drawn up with prudence,

* James Gandon, an English architect who became a member of the committee of the Dublin Society, designed the Custom House, Four Courts, and several of the finest buildings of the Irish capital.

and the Society's progress was not affected by incorporation. The 'Royal' title was assumed in 1820. By that time the Society, whose earliest meetings had been held in Berkeley's Philosophical Rooms in Trinity College, had acquired the finest of the Dublin mansions by purchase from the Duke of Leinster. Leinster House remained its head-quarters until 1923, when the premises were taken over by the Free State and converted into Parliament buildings. It had opened a Botanic Garden (1776), buying the ground from the family of Tickell, Addison's biographer, and a Natural History Museum (1792). Its chemical laboratory is said to have been the first of its kind in the Three Kingdoms; and with its Schools of Art and Architecture, as well as with its systematic teaching of science, it offered services which could not be had elsewhere in Ireland. Famous men held its Professorships, such as the mysterious adventurer, Karl Ludwig Metzler (who afterwards assumed the name of Giesceke), a wanderer from Germany, learned in mineralogy, explorer, actor, journalist, Freemason, the friend of Mozart and of Schiller, and perhaps the original of William Meister. By the legislation of the last century, such as that which created the Science and Art Department of 1878, Government took over many of the material responsibilities which the Society had so well shouldered. The Society, however, by the membership of its Councils and its continued activity in research, has maintained a tradition imposed on it by its association with such names as Sir William Petty and Molyneux, Rowan Hamilton of the Quaternions, and Fitzgerald* the Irish scientist, a predecessor of Einstein.

The main work of the Society has been, and is still,

* Professor G. F. Fitzgerald, F.T.C.D., was Honorary Secretary of the Society in 1888. He first demonstrated the possibility of producing electromagnetic wireless waves. Also he produced a theory called the 'Fitzgerald contraction,' which accounted for the experiments of the American physicist, Michelson. Lorenz and Poincaré considered the Fitzgerald contraction to be an actual physical phenomenon which they explained by means of a hypothesis about the laws of action of electro-magnetic forces. A different and much more profound way of regarding both the new form of the Principle of Relativity and the consequences which flowed from it (the Fitzgerald contraction and the local time of Lorentz) is due to Einstein ('Time, Space, and Motion,' by Professor A. V. Vasiliev).

the promotion of the agricultural interests of the country. Inevitably so, since by far the greater part of the population of Ireland depends, and has always depended, for its daily life directly on the land. In this sphere too the Society performed functions which the Government eventually discharged, notably in the Congested Districts of the West of Ireland ; * and in 1887, the Chief Secretary (the late Lord Balfour) caused Parliament to vote £5000 in aid of its schemes for improving the breeds of cattle and horses. Outside of Ireland its best-known office has been the holding annually of an Agricultural or Spring Show and of a Horse Show in summer. The first Agricultural Show was held as far back as 1737, at the instance of Samuel Madden with his system of premiums, and was the first exhibition of its kind in these islands. The famous Irish Horse Show is of later origin. The first Horse Show held under the auspices of the Society attracted 6000 visitors. This was in 1867 ; in 1868 the Society offered prizes for jumping ; and in 1874 the attendance had risen to 22,000. The Society then leased a large amount of land in the suburbs of Dublin, at Ballsbridge, for the holding of its annual shows, building structures to its requirements ; and how well its policy in this respect has been rewarded is shown by the fact that for the last thirty years attendances have been constantly on the increase, reaching latterly, in the case of the Horse Show, to a figure of 100,000. In 1897, when the present King was a visitor, the entries were 1400 and the attendance 66,000. The August exhibition, without losing any of its usefulness, had become the chief social event of the Irish capital.

The Dublin Society was the product of the order established by the Settlement of 1689—the Settlement of which Locke and Molyneux were the prophets. That order lasted in Ireland, although weakened latterly, until 1922, when another Settlement, also justly described as revolutionary, reversed it as far as twenty-six counties were concerned, and in appearance at least left the

* 'In August 1891, the Act for the improvement of the Congested Districts in Ireland received the Royal assent, and large sums of public money became available for carrying out such work as the Society had initiated and carried out at its own expense' ('A History of the Royal Dublin Society,' by Henry F. Berry, I.S.O., Litt.D., 1915).

people of Swift and Berkeley, of Burke and Grattan, denuded not only of all their political power, but even of their title-deeds to Irish nationality. The wheel had come full circle. The theorists of the Gaelic Revival and the Catholic State are in the reverse manner as exclusive as Swift, who made membership of the Irish nation subject to conformity to the Episcopalian religion. A sort of neo-Gaelic mediævalism is set up as a test of Irish nationality, and this new orthodoxy would make the Anglo-Irish minority, better called the modern Irish, Catholics and Protestants, to exist in their own country, as the religious majority did in the eighteenth century, merely on sufferance. Many facts, however—and notably the fact of the survival with renewed power of the Dublin Society, an institution of the minority in question, eight years after the Settlement—fail to correspond with the Gaelic philosophy of Irish history. Protestant ascendancy did not prove to be practical politics in the eighteenth century (for, as Burke said, the Protestants could not enjoy freedom while they denied it to their fellow-countrymen); nor will Gaelicism, understood as the withdrawal of the Free State from all English and European intellectual influence, the blotting out of the memories of Swift and Burke, and of two hundred years of Irish history, prove to be practical politics in the twentieth.

The problems of the Royal Dublin Society in the last fifteen years have been the problems of that large number of ex-Unionists who, while remaining pro-British or Imperialist in opinion and sentiment, are attached to their country and its life, and have desired to offer the newly constituted authority in Southern Ireland something more than mere passive obedience. The graver difficulties of the Society arose, however, before the Settlement of 1922, when the country was in the throes of what is now officially designated as the Anglo-Irish War, but would be more aptly described as civil war. After the Easter Week Rising of 1916, it was thought necessary that the Society should demonstrate its loyalty to lawful authority as then constituted; and the course was taken at a General Meeting of expelling a member, a well-known Nationalist and former M.P., Count Plunkett, two of whose sons had participated in the

leadership of the rebellion. The Society was denounced as a hostile institution in the national press; and a few years later, when Sinn Fein was at the height of its popular influence, it was threatened by boycott at the hands of the Irish cattle-breeders. Ruin was avoided by the hasty reinstatement of Count Plunkett—a course dictated not only by interest but by logic and common sense. A year later the inheritors (or a section of them) of the rebellion of 1916 had become, by agreement with Great Britain, the lawful Government of twenty-six counties; and the Southern Unionists, with the exception of an uncompromising element—our modern Jacobites—took up the position that the same principle which obliged them to condemn the Sinn Fein revolt now obliged them to render to the new Cæsar the things which were his. Common sense, too, reassured them. 'What!' Berkeley wrote in 1712, 'must we then submit our necks to the sword? and is there no help, no refuge against extreme tyranny established by law? In answer to this I say . . . it is not to be found that men in their wits should seek the destruction of their people, by such cruel and unnatural decrees as some are forward to suppose.'* Against the Jacobites and Absolutists of Queen Anne's reign, Berkeley was seeking a ground which would enable Tories and Churchmen to accept settlement in favour of the Hanoverian succession without departure from principle or acceptance of Locke's contractual theory of Government, and its corollary, the lawfulness of resistance to princes. The 'loyalists' of the South of Ireland have, without knowing it, been faced since 1922 with the same question with which Berkeley and Swift had to grapple in the great controversy of Queen Anne's reign.

The members of the Free State Government have shown themselves to be 'men in their wits.' The phrase 'cruel and unnatural decrees' is hardly to be applied even to the most exclusive side of Free State policy, its Gaelic educational programme. The case of the Dublin Society, which with Trinity College is the most important of the surviving institutions of the older Ireland, is much to the point. The personnel of its

* 'The Discourse on Passive Obedience.'

governing bodies is still mainly of the old régime, although the general membership in recent years has been enlarged and democratised. But Mr Cosgrave and his colleagues, especially those of them who are in touch with the chief of Irish industries, have recognised freely the economic usefulness, and indeed the indispensability of the Society and its work. Thereby hangs a tale. For it is argued by the suspicious that the prosperity and continued importance of such institutions of the old régime as the Dublin Society and Trinity College, afford proof that the 'old Catholic population' is still oppressed at its heart, and that the Free State is the unwitting instrument of English Imperialism and Freemasonry. The following remarks are from a pamphlet which was circulated in the republican interest at the recent bye-election in Longford, Westmeath :

' Even in the Irish Free State, where the Catholic Irish form more than 92 per cent. of the population, the anti-Irish and anti-Catholic party, closely allied with International Freemasonry, are very strongly organised and are supported by the whole weight of British influence. A large section of the economic and intellectual life of the Free State is dominated by the non-Catholic minority. This is true of the Dublin University . . . it is also true of the Royal Dublin Society—and of most even of the larger commercial organisations.'

The author of 'Ireland's Peril,' a Jesuit, is certainly right in saying that the non-Catholic minority in Southern Ireland is even still, in proportion to its numbers, the wealthier section of the community—certainly it possesses more than eight per cent. of the national income (and pays more than eight per cent. of the taxes), and certainly it has more than an eight per cent. control of the banks, the educational and the political institutions of the Kingdom. But is there any political inference to be drawn from such 'religious' statistics? There is none. A very little difference of political opinion now exists between the Catholics of the middle and upper classes in the Free State and the Protestant minority. Catholic directors of Irish banks and the 'larger commercial organisations' are not usually to be found in the ranks of the republicans and separatists. Most of them appear to be, in Mr de Valera's wide sense of the term, Imperialists.

Indeed, the Government, or Free State, party finds itself in social life embarrassed less by the existence of republican and anti-English opinions and ways of thought, than by the existence of a sentiment for the old régime, not at all confined to former Unionists or to the bourgeoisie, and still less to the members of any one Church. Here, again, the Royal Dublin Society makes Irish history, and provides a footnote to it. Nothing so revives memories of the past order of Irish life as the annual Horse Show of the Society, whereat the English Viceroy and the English Chief Secretary were once the chief guests; now the chief guests are the Governor-General and the members of the Free State cabinet. A national anthem must be played, and a national flag must be flown. But which national anthem or which national flag? The 'Soldier's Song' and the Tricolour, or 'God Save the King' and the Union Jack? Mr Cosgrave and his colleagues are no Fascists, and they do not call on the old Loyalists, or Unionists, to participate in the official pieties of the State. But having adopted the Tricolour as a flag and the 'Soldier's Song' as an anthem, they insist on their observance whenever they are themselves present at public functions. In recognition of the 'facts,' in deference to established authority, the Tricolour is flown over the grand stand at Ballsbridge in Horse Show Week, and the Governor-General and his party are welcomed to the strains of the 'Soldier's Song.' These may have been hard acknowledgments for a Society with a royal charter to make. 'Loyalists' might accept the new order; but they did not cease to condemn the events, such as the Rising of 1916 and other and later employments of physical force, ugly memories for many of them, which had brought it about—events with which the Tricolour and the 'Soldier's Song' must always be associated. Nor did submission carry with it necessarily a balance of material advantages. The official presence of representatives of the native Government was not essential to the success of the Show, which, indeed, as a society function, largely depended upon English patronage. Moreover, the masses of the Irish people themselves have no particular pride in either the new flag or the new anthem, but regard both as mere emblems of party. In the result, however, as is the

paradoxical Irish way, not only does the Show preserve its character as an entertainment of fashion *; but it is the one annual occasion when pro-British or royalist feeling in the Free State finds itself publicly gratified. The occasion is afforded by a post-treaty feature of the Show, the international military jumping; at its conclusion each team rides up to the Governor-General's box while the Irish army band plays the respective national anthems. Invariably the British officers and their anthem get the best reception of all from the crowd. Is this a perverse demonstration of the essential 'Jacobitism' of Ireland? 'Free Staters' attribute it to the 'slave-mind' which delights to embarrass the new governing classes, just because these are Irish.† But the same people who cheer for the 'King over the water' are as likely as not to vote republican at the elections. The Free State represents the 'despotism of fact,' as opposed alike to the lost cause ('the return of the British'), and the impossible cause (an integral republic).‡

* In Mr Bernard Shaw's 'Apple Cart' one of the characters complains that all the 'best families' are going to Ireland; 'on account of the Horse Show,' it is explained. The R. D. S. prints Mr Shaw's jest in its propaganda.

† It may be recalled that Hegel described 'the people' as that part of the nation which does not know what it wants. The success of the Free State is the success of a minority which knows what it wants. No one will pretend that the Free State is popular.

‡ Nevertheless, Irish 'Jacobitism' ought to be recognised by intelligent politicians. Much of the failure of the Free State to call forth popular loyalties may be due to a certain dogmatism and a want of historical imagination on the part of the governing class. The two flags and the two anthems difficulty is much to the point in this connection. Many suggestions have been made for resolving it, some of them excellent; but it would require a Dictator to carry through a change. Yet outside the political circles very few Irishmen really feel that the Tricolour is their flag. It has, in fact, become a party emblem for the possession of which the partisans of Mr Cosgrave and of Mr de Valera quarrel. The same is true of the 'Soldier's Song,' which has the added advantage of being a positive offence artistically.

There would seem to be no reason why this anthem should not be replaced by one of the many patriotic Irish songs, often set to a lovely native air, which have no associations with party. To find another flag would not be so easy, for it is now stated on the best authority that the Irish never had a national flag. The Irish Jacobite regiments abroad had each their separate flag, and all these flags were English! The story that the blue flag with a golden harp was flown over Dublin Castle during the sittings of James II's Irish Parliament appears to be apocryphal; but the adoption of this flag would have the merit of at once satisfying Irish Catholic

Bishop Berkeley once noted ironically that the sole duty of an Irish patriot was 'to nourish opposition.' The same philosopher spoke sadly of the 'suspicion' which so many of his countrymen deemed it necessary to show towards the projects of improvements on which his friends like Prior and Madden were engaged. Happily, his pessimism proved unjustified, so far as the chief public enterprise started in his times was concerned; for the Dublin Society has survived to confound the sectaries and the party-men, and to complete its bicentenary amid general good will.

J. M. HONE.

sentiment, and—for its recognition that the Free State is a Kingdom—pleasing the loyalists. Though the Free State has the status of a Dominion, Ireland, as has often been pointed out, is a mother—not a daughter—country, and her history is not that of a British Colony. In the King's title Ireland is in fact distinguished as a Kingdom from the other members of the Commonwealth. This point is perhaps overlooked by those who, on the ground that the Free State is within the British Commonwealth, urge the claims of the British National Anthem and the Union Jack, either solely or in conjunction with those of a local anthem and a local flag. Indeed, some apologists of the attitude of the Dublin Government have explained with metaphysical subtlety that the official objection to the use of 'God Save the King' on State occasions, means that the Free State is insisting on the King as its own monarch, and is far from being an attempt to diminish His Majesty.

Art. 6.—RUSSIA AND THE FIVE YEARS' PLAN.

THE visions of to-day are the facts of to-morrow. At present few people in this country believe that the principle of Soviet Collectivism as opposed to Western Capitalism is the issue confronting the world. The struggle is increasing in intensity at a time when the great capitalist countries are suffering from an unparalleled trade depression of which the end is not yet in sight. It does not follow, however, that it will be complicated in highly developed nations by sanguinary revolution as in backward Russia. The poorest people in this country are far better off than the great mass of Russian citizens. The time is, however, approaching when the wealth in England, now mostly concentrated in a few hands, will be more evenly distributed, but the process of distribution will be peaceful. The condition of the Russians improved when absolute Communism was replaced nearly ten years ago by the New Economic Policy. This in turn gave way to the more precise Five Years' Plan, brought into operation on Oct. 1, 1928, and outlining the course of Russia's national economy. Its object is to secure that Production and Distribution, while being rapidly and immensely developed, shall be maintained in stable equilibrium so as to eliminate over-production. The State Planning Commission (GOSPLAN) determined the work to be done during the ensuing five years. On this framework are based in great detail the schemes for the respective annual, quarterly, monthly, and ten-day periods. The plan, like all other grandiose projects, is far from being worked according to schedule. Nevertheless, Western nations cannot escape its increasingly fierce competition.

The plan is a means to an end, and is not intended to be the coping-stone of the transformation of Russia into one amazing State Trust, which shall regulate the economic life and cultural development of every citizen. The experiment is truly audacious. A backward and naturally slothful population, already exceeding 150 millions, enormously outnumbering those of any two European nations and much larger than that of the United States, is the instrument. Three-fourths of Russia's inhabitants are of the white races and four-fifths are rural. This

plan is guided by a handful of men who have vast ideas, but little experience, and whose knowledge of other countries is necessarily most superficial.

The Russian Government, in its desperate haste to attain its ultimate goal, World Revolution, presents a curious paradox. It preaches 'brotherly collaboration' and Communism, while creating super-capitalism in fact though not in name.

The principle has decided advantages over that adopted by the Trusts of the West. These are isolated in water-tight compartments. When they are engaged in similar activities they sometimes compete with mutually disastrous results. Absence of collaboration often causes over-production and consequent unemployment. Under the Five Years' Plan output and distribution are scientifically regulated—or should be—by the GOSPLAN. When one branch of industry needs money for further development this is provided by allotting funds from the undistributed profits of some more prosperous undertaking. This procedure is legitimate where the State is the General Manager. The unwieldy, creaking Russian machine is gradually running more smoothly, and if the system of the West is to survive its methods must be improved. If Germany, for instance, adopted the Bolshevik principle, as many of her citizens fear she will do, she would work it out far more efficiently than the Russians can hope to do.

Before discussing the Soviet Government's projects something should be said about pre-war Russia as an aid to comparing the new with the old. I knew the old Russia from the Court to the hovel, and knowledge of the language enabled me to study her economic life in villages and towns, from the Baltic to the Pacific. Generally speaking, the pre-war system resembled that of Western countries. Agriculture, industry, and trade were in private hands. One could work or be idle as one wished, and strikes were not unusual. During the World War, when everything was supposed to be subject to military control, statistics showed that more strikes occurred in the Petrograd region in a given period than in the whole of the United Kingdom. The population, now rapidly increasing, was mostly illiterate, for the Orthodox Church discouraged education. The people were lazy, partly perhaps because they had little except death in prospect and lived on the border of

starvation. Famine was frequent, although the country was underpopulated and had immense areas of most fertile soil which only lacked good husbandry. Drink was a curse, which is not surprising in the circumstances, and the sanitary conditions, even in well-to-do houses, were horrible. Corruption was inevitable, for the enormous bureaucracy was unable to live without it. For instance, a clerk in what we term the second division of the Civil Service might receive about 25*l.* yearly, whereas his English colleague's salary would be many times as much, but both had to live respectably. The fact must be emphasised that the Russians were not efficient organisers, and we shall see presently that the strenuous efforts of the Soviet Government do not appear to have appreciably improved them in this respect. In my report to the War Office in 1905 on the Russo-Japanese War, I predicted that its lessons would not be assimilated.

Russia and her people, who have many endearing qualities, have always greatly attracted me. I was anxious to visit her again last year in order to see something of the working of the Five Years' Plan. I, therefore, had a conversation with a secretary of the Soviet Embassy last February, to ask whether a visa would be granted to me. I expected my visit to last only a few minutes, but it proved lengthy. The secretary was a pure Russian and well-read. When the World War broke out he was a civilian of very good standing, and was called up for service. After various adventures on the Russian western front he was taken prisoner and interned in Germany. I expressed my belief that the only way to make Russia communist at heart would be to exterminate everybody over six years of age. We spoke about education, which is undoubtedly making rapid progress, especially in rural areas, and is aided by an enormous output of books and pamphlets containing much of value for everyday life. In discussing the food question with this secretary I remarked that the interminable food queues in the towns must greatly prejudice the industrial output apart from the under-nourishment of the people which it causes. He seemed to think that matters were improving in this respect, and he may have had the new communal kitchens in mind.

In great revolutions a State Church has commonly been

the first to suffer. This has nothing to do with religion. Doctrine may be killed, but religion will persist in some form, as it does among the rudest tribes. The Orthodox Church had always been a dominant factor in Russian life and exerted immense influence, as all Churches naturally endeavour to do. In pre-war Russia it ruled with a heavy hand, but the Press of foreign countries paid little attention to that fact. The number of Feast days was large, and encouraged idleness, while superstition was rampant in every section of society. I told a charming young friend, who knew many languages and whose father occupied one of the most important posts in Petrograd, that I was about to visit Moscow. She begged me to procure for her a few drops of specially holy oil on sale at the celebrated Iberian shrine. She was desperately in love with a young gallant of the Bodyguard, who had returned her affection until some 'horrid girl' had captured him. 'If,' she said, 'I rub a few drops of the oil behind my left ear everything will come right. But perhaps the priest will not have any left, and then I shall die.' I easily executed the commission, the oil supply being, of course, inexhaustible. The wedding followed, and the bride said to me: 'I told you so.' Lothario had, however, discovered meanwhile that her dowry would be larger than that of her rival.

The Tsar Nicholas once told me that he had twice attempted to introduce a sound system of elementary education by laymen in order to stop the teaching of those 'ridiculous so-called miracles.' He added: 'The Church was too strong for me,' meaning that if he had persisted it would have caused a Palace Revolution. Tolstoy shows how Russia was over-churched more than a century ago. The problem confronting the Soviet Government was how to break the superstitious hold of the Orthodox Church on the people and make them work steadily. Bolshevism would otherwise collapse. Christians, declare the Bolsheviks, violate their professions every day for selfish purposes, and religious teaching in the schools was forbidden. A number of redundant churches were closed, often by wish of the parishioners, for the priests levied toll by the sale of candles and other outward professions of faith. Pure materialism is the doctrine now inculcated, but divine service is still available for those who desire

it. Church marriages are also permitted, but they have no legal significance, which is obtainable only at a Registry Office. The Bolsheviks believe that to stamp out religion is one of their essential and most difficult tasks.

Their reasoning is similar to Trotsky's. That extraordinary man was born a Jew and had to study the Old Testament in his youth. He asked his teacher one day how, if there is no God (meaning some utterly inscrutable Power), the Universe came into being. The teacher, himself a doubting Thomas, could not answer him. Trotsky thereupon was satisfied—or said he was—that there is no such Power. Bolsheviks argue that the soul is synonymous with breath, and dies when breath ceases. I have devoted some space to the religious question, as its treatment by the Soviet authorities helps one to understand why they believe in bloody revolution as the necessary prelude to drab uniformity, although this may become less drab if their economic tree comes to full bearing.

The secretary asked what I wished to see in Russia. I replied that military matters did not interest me as the Bolshevik's only path to World Revolution is through peaceful penetration aided by propaganda. I wanted to travel at random and would welcome an official conductor who would hear every question which I might put. Besides, I said, I have eyes and ears. Country districts specially interested me, so that I might compare pre-war farming with that of the existing small-holdings and the great State farms. The standard of living and the spread of education, especially among the older generation in rural areas, also called for investigation. I also wished to see the recreations provided in villages of the new Russia, where formerly there had been none except the pageantry of the Orthodox Church on certain feast days.

Although Bolshevism aims at World Revolution, it must nevertheless be militarily unaggressive. War would cause its structure to crumble by ruining its rapidly increasing trade with foreign countries. Bolshevism triumphed because a great nation was sick of being slaughtered, maimed, and starved for an idea which interested only politicians and was not understood by the people. A victorious military leader, backed by a devoted army, would be likely to install himself as Dictator and put his rivals out of business. It was for this reason

that an incompetent trooper was given the task of attempting to take Warsaw in the Russo-Polish conflict, an enterprise which a reasonably efficient commander could easily have accomplished. Stalin managed to exile Trotsky, a real military genius, because he had good grounds for suspecting his projects. The Bolsheviks are pure materialists, and their proposal at Geneva in 1927 for the abolition of armaments must have been sincere, for it was in their own interests. The argument that it was a deep-laid scheme to catch the world off its guard is ridiculous.

One of the conditions precedent to the resumption of diplomatic relations with Russia in 1929, was that there should be no official propaganda in this country. I am not afraid of it myself, for in the highly improbable event that the men should be attracted by its cruel aspects, the women would certainly show more sense. The Soviet Government could not possibly fulfil its undertaking, for the Third International (KOMINTERN) is the organiser of Revolutions and the soul of the Soviet Executive, which is therefore compelled to disseminate propaganda; it cannot help itself. During my travels I met a Soviet official just when our Foreign Secretary was being heckled on this subject in Parliament. Mr Henderson, in trying to hunt with the Opposition hounds and run with the Bolshevik hare, as he had done in the religious question, made a sad mess of the business. He did not placate the one and was laughed at by the Russian Press for his pains. I remarked to my companion that Bolshevism and propaganda are indissoluble, and he replied without hesitation: 'Of course they are.' It is foolish and dangerous, because we happen to detest some of the Soviet Government's practices, to stress the partial failure of the Five Years' Plan. The development of Russia's resources already achieved in the face of unparalleled difficulties is amazing, and will increasingly affect the whole world. The Soviet Government had positively to start from bed-rock.

As soon as the Revolution broke out I warned our Government that Russia was 'dead to the allied cause.' Our subsequent intervention in her Civil War rallied many imperialists to the Bolsheviks, for, as a Russian *grande dame* told me recently: 'We place Russia first,

and would support the Bolsheviks again in similar circumstances.' The intervention was certain not only to fail, but also to pile up a big account against us in any negotiations over the Russian debts. The time has gone by when foreign Governments can cure their own ills by ostracising Russia. I thought Moscow would welcome a tourist with my qualifications in view of the material progress that is being made there. The reply to my request was long delayed and disappointing. It states: 'I approached the authorities in Moscow with the object of ascertaining their views, and it seems that the latter, for general reasons, are not inclined to take a positive stand on the matter.' That is characteristic of Russian officialdom yesterday and to-day. It dislikes giving a definite reply. Either Moscow considers me a dangerous character, or it may be that our Foreign Secretary prefers that I should not go to Russia. Moscow has a large measure of success with the numbers of ordinary foreign tourists ignorant of pre-war Russia who visit there. They are encouraged. An American magnate was persuaded after a visit of some weeks' duration that the Russians have become as hard-working as his own people. He was, of course, unable to read their newspapers.

The Soviet authorities have strong backing among some English people for all their actions. I informed a person very well known in the worlds of politics and literature, of Moscow's snub, and was told in reply that owing to the number of tourists there was no room for even one more traveller because of the scarcity of food and lack of accommodation. I then asked another admirer of the Soviet Government, a member of Parliament, to find out why my visa was refused. He seemed hopeful of success. After a time I sent him a reminder, and heard no more. Another legislator, Mr E. F. Wise, broadcast his advice to English holiday-makers to spend their vacations in Russia. Evidently there is something which the Soviet Government prefers that I should not see. My view is that the rulers of Russia are overshadowed by the black cloud of Fear lest one should see that all is not going according to plan. They admit they are cruel; and savagery, suspicion, perhaps vanity, rendered me an object of distrust. The tourist is expected to see everything through rose-coloured spectacles. I have

dealt at some length on these points to show that I am under no obligation to say pleasant things about the Soviet Government.

Stalin is more practical and opportunist in political and economic affairs than his rival, Trotsky, but both men hope to see the West submerged under bloody Revolution before they die. They may differ as to the day of its advent, but both men are typical of the fantastic ideas with which Bolsheviks are often obsessed. An acquaintance of mine asked Trotsky at Constantinople in 1929 what he thought of the prospects of his cherished project. He replied that it could not unfortunately materialise until after the coming war between the British Empire and the United States, in which he is a firm believer!

Lenin, the fanatic and Dictator, imagined at first that Communism was practicable, partly because it was his dream, and partly because the system had worked in a more or less disjointed fashion for a short time during the stress of Civil War and the allied blockade. In November 1917, Russia was almost denuded of supplies, munitions, tools, transport, clothing, nearly everything in fact. All appliances had to be thrown into the common store until the Bolsheviks emerged victorious from the struggle. The situation in Russia then began to change. The peasantry were in possession of the land and, as some of us foretold, refused to continue to supply food for the towns in return for a worthless currency. Lenin tried force with them and failed. He then realised that the peasants were beginning to throw off the yoke of military discipline which Communism inevitably involves. He, therefore, sanctioned in 1921 the New Economic Policy (NEP) which he had previously stubbornly resisted. He also endeavoured unsuccessfully to heal the bitter feud which had arisen when Trotsky accused Stalin, one of Lenin's chief advisers, of military incompetence at a very critical moment in the Civil War.

The NEP, as it is officially termed, aimed at increasing the agricultural output by inducing the peasants to produce more than they themselves required, in return for which their industrial needs were to be better supplied. A single tax in cash was also substituted for all the other numerous taxes, and the detested deliveries in kind were abolished. This was the modest beginning from which

the Five Years' Plan emerged with Stalin, the Secretary of the omnipotent Communist Party, as the overwhelmingly outstanding figure. The plan is another proof that new institutions, such as the NEP, do not, as a rule, long retain the character given them by those who set them up.

In contrast with the complete socialisation of the basic industries, agriculture and home trade are still in a transition stage. It is evident that too high a standard has been set, for although the driving force behind it is terrific, the contemplated results have not been achieved. A kind of moratorium of output was, indeed, declared from October last until this month in an attempt to catch up the arrears of work. It is now hoped that Russia's industrial development may be standing on its own base by the end of 1937, four years later than was originally believed possible. Notwithstanding the most strenuous efforts to spread education, to combat drunkenness, to inculcate the elementary principles of hygiene, and make work a labour of love, old customs die hard. This is not surprising, as amateurs are the managers of this super-capitalistic Trust. Nevertheless, the great idea is there and is fostered in every possible way by the Communist Party. This, including about 110,000 serving in the Red Army, numbers less than 2 per cent. of the adult population of Russia, and is distributed over the entire territory. It is surprising that such a small minority is able to work its will. It is not, however, easy to graduate as a member fully fledged. A man may really desire to be recognised as a Communist, but the accident of what may be termed respectable or well-to-do parentage may debar him from becoming one of the elect. The rulers apparently believe in heredity. In any case an aspirant must prove that he is worthy to be one of the chosen people by passing through a probationary stage. The probationers appear to account for about 30 per cent. of the total.

The sponsors of the Five Years' Plan hope in the relatively near future at least to rival the United States if not to surpass them as an industrial nation. This ideal recalls Peter the Great's attempt to modernise Russia in a hurry. He thought she could assimilate in a few years what it had taken Western nations centuries to digest. The Soviet authorities, however, are more

happily situated than was he, for they have unlimited resources in man power, materials, and science to exploit. They have initiated on a grandiose scale the struggle between Individualism and Collectivism, and believe they can stamp out the former as has happened in a more agreeable manner in Denmark. Nothing deters the Bolsheviks, who never lose heart. In Russia all private trade and even the free public markets are being ruthlessly abolished, in some cases before substitutes for them have been created. Eventually there are to be no financial or other worries to trouble the individual. Everybody shall be free on the conclusion of the day's mental or physical labour to enjoy—if not too exhausted—the delights of art, the drama, literature, music, propaganda, radio, and any other healthy recreation.

The economic development of the Soviet Federal Union is financed by internal loans often forcibly provided out of the workers' wages, by the gold received for exports, and by foreign credits. At present, however, in view of the enormous potentialities of the Soviet market, these credits are 'quite inadequate.' Agriculture is the predominant industry, and the whole economic system is based on it. Stalin is, of course, well aware of the slothful and superstitious temperament, at any rate, of the older generation. Collective farms on a gigantic scale were, therefore, instituted, and are an impressive part of the Five Years' Plan. About 40 per cent. of the peasants were collectivised by last March, and it was originally hoped that the process would be completed in 1933 when the present Plan expires. It is now recognised that this will not be the case.

The idea is, of course, that these State farms shall produce sufficient and unfailing quantities of food for home consumption and export, and that all peasants will realise the advantages of these farms over private farming. The idea is excellent. No peasant need worry. The area of a collective farm may be 150,000 acres or more. Scientific farming with a steady supply of labour is replacing the old happy-go-lucky system which frequently caused famine where this horror should never have been permitted to rear its ugly head. The best workers benefit more than those who are lazy. Improved methods, carefully selected seeds, rotation of crops, the

very latest American machinery with American experts as instructors in its use and manufacture, must be far more profitable for all concerned than the millions of small holdings. Even if the Russian peasant should be naturally a good worker he could not purchase this machinery, or keep it in order, or know how to procure good seeds.

It is not yet possible to accommodate all the peasantry on these State farms. The good boys are, therefore, assisted by Government machinery so far as is practicable, but the supply falls short of the demand. It is hoped to increase this official assistance six-fold by October 1935, thereby falsifying the GOSPLAN'S original estimate. Where Government machinery is taken on hire, a proportion of the crops, usually about one-third, is handed over in kind to the State. 'The ample proposition that hope makes in all designs begun on earth below fails in the promised largeness.' The Soviet Government has had a good deal of trouble with those comparatively well-to-do peasants called *kulaks*. It classifies peasants in three categories—rich, middle, and poor. The second and third classes must benefit immensely by collective farming or by State aid. The *kulaks*, on the other hand, having improved their condition by hard work, naturally resent giving up most of their property to the State. They are as conservative and mistrustful of change as their brethren in other lands, and offered a passive but stubborn resistance, which continues.

Stalin's over-zealous adherents in rural areas resorted to force to make the Five Years' Plan work according to schedule. The *kulak* was, therefore, transported to a collective farm, or else he was transferred to poorer soil, in each case being deprived of most of his property. Stalin recognised that this conflict was rendering the food problem still more difficult of satisfactory solution. He, therefore, appealed to his followers in March last, to substitute Persuasion for Force, as this was, he said, wrong morally and legally. He told them that they had become 'intoxicated with success and were destroying the Communist Party's policy.' The recalcitrants must, he declared, be taught by object-lessons and propaganda to realise the benefits of collectivism. Judging from articles in the Russian Press, the methods of persuasion

are intended to be drastic. The remaining *kulaks* find it difficult, if not impossible, to purchase their requirements unless they belong to an official co-operative organisation. Soviet farming has, nevertheless, already adversely affected agriculture in Western lands, and will undoubtedly in time exert an increasing influence.

After making due allowance for various factors to be mentioned later, which delay the progress of the Five Years' Plan, the fact remains that it is making real progress. The petroleum industry, like many others, is expanding at a great rate. Before the outbreak of the World War it was in private hands and the annual export was less than one million tons. During that cataclysm and the subsequent foreign intervention the figure fell to zero, but to-day more than three and a half million tons of petroleum are exported annually. A further great increase is assured and valuable new oil-fields have meanwhile been discovered. The prices realised leave a profit, and the huge oil combines in other countries have been forced to come to terms with the Soviet authorities. Their financial resources are consequently mounting quickly. Largely owing to Russian competition, another oil-rate war broke out in November last. The great European oil-rings threw down the gauntlet to the American concerns, each endeavouring to smash its rivals. Price-cutting on a grand scale was indulged in, although the ordinary customer has not, so far as I am aware, benefited appreciably. He seldom does. Now, if the oil or any other indispensable industry should be efficiently conducted on Soviet principles, prices would be stabilised and afford a fair profit, and the shareholders of the West would not be in their present unhappy position.

The great manufacturing industries, the electrification system, the railways and automobile transport, comprise the most spectacular portions of the Five Years' Plan. They are entirely socialised, and administered on the lines laid down by the GOSPLAN. As an instance of the grandiose scheme of development already attained and in contemplation, the output of electric power in 1927-28 exceeded 5000 million kilowatt hours, more than twice the output of 1913. It is planned to reach 22,000 million kilowatt hours by October 1933. It is

estimated that some of this power can be supplied at a cost of about one-eighth of a penny per unit. The hydraulic resources of the Soviet Union are estimated at one-fifth of the world's total. In England, on the other hand, $1\frac{1}{2}d.$ per unit may be charged in one district, whereas in one adjoining, supplied from the same source, the price is $7d.$ per unit, although the rate of wages is the same in both cases. These vast enterprises demand a greatly improved system of railway and automotive transport in order to improve distribution and cheapen prices. Russia had 35,000 miles of railway in 1913. There are now more than 45,000 miles, and it is estimated that, by the end of 1933, the figure will be increased to 60,000. This mileage will, however, fall far short of meeting transport requirements in view of the great distances and the heavy increase in traffic. The Plan provides, therefore, for the mass production of motor cars and lorries for areas devoid of railways and as connecting links between these.

There was, and perhaps is still, only one first-rate metalled highway in Russia, namely, the great Georgian military road connecting the Caucasus with Transcaucasia. In the towns cobble stones are usual. The GOSPLAN'S road schemes are also majestic. At present there are about 600,000 miles of highways, all of them, except for 25,000 miles, being 'dirt' roads. It is hoped that, by the end of 1933, 700,000 miles of new roads will be constructed at a cost of about 500 million pounds. The land, of course, costs nothing. Improvements in marine and river transport have also not been lost sight of, and great efforts are being made to develop aviation. The importation of immense quantities of machinery and raw materials is the corollary to these vast schemes, and must benefit correspondingly those who supply them. Russia, on the other hand, is already helping to satisfy the wants of other countries, for her principal articles of export exceed two hundred in number. It is difficult to realise the significance of all these multitudinous plans where millions of money are the units.

The United States has never recognised the Soviet Government. Nevertheless out of seventy-four 'technical aid' contracts for production, construction, and manufacture, concluded between 1923 and 1929 inclusive,

thirty-three were placed in Germany, twenty-four in the United States, and three in Great Britain. We are in a difficult position, for the Soviet Government might at some future time rely on precedents of our own making. It has a claim involving hundreds of millions of pounds for our intervention in the Civil War. Unless Moscow is satisfied with the result of the Debt negotiations, it might for some reason say to British contractors, who had granted extensive credits as the Americans are doing, that they should look for payment of any balances to their own Government. It can point to the fact that, although England did not directly intervene in the American Civil War, she nevertheless paid for the material injury caused by the 'Alabama.' Indeed, owing to miscalculations, she paid a good deal more than could be called due. The Soviet authorities might also say that the British Government confiscated enemy private property after the World War, and referred the owners to their own bankrupt authorities for restitution. The Allies, in my opinion, made a sad blunder when they refused Lenin's offer of a settlement in 1919. They believed what they wished to believe, namely, that Bolshevism could not last.

The Soviet Government has, however, punctually carried out its own foreign obligations. Apart from any question of morality, it will be in its interests to continue this policy, for Russia must import certain raw materials which can only be supplied by the British Empire. It is estimated that her increasing exports will enable her to import goods and materials to the amount of 170 million pounds in 1933, an increase of 80 per cent. over the first year of the current Five Years' Plan. Concessions are on a different footing from foreign contracts. Their management is always an object of suspicion to the Soviet authorities, who had good reason on more than one occasion for their mistrust. Moreover, the workmen are unreliable and object to labour-saving machinery. The official co-operative organisations are making great progress, and are gradually crowding out private trade. They are, however, unable at present to meet the demands, and their smaller competitors are still worse off.

Russia, although underpopulated, has her own unemployment problem, caused by the migration of

workers to the towns, which has not yet been offset by the increasing numbers absorbed in industry and by conscript labour. As some industries are, of course, more popular than others, there is no alternative to this occasional conscription, which decreases unemployment. According to Soviet statistics more than a million persons were out of work a year ago as compared with half that number five years earlier ; but the figure is now decreasing considerably. Dumping has caused much worry to other countries and is likely to cause a great deal more. The overhead charges in Russia are comparatively trifling, and the standard of living of her citizens is deplorably low. The Soviet Government is, therefore, able to sell at a profit to other countries and below their cost of production. Russian exports need not reach foreign markets directly. Petroleum, for instance, may be sold to an American firm which consigns it to the East. As much of the capital sunk in basic industries cannot give a return for some years, the Soviet must get the best price it can. On the other hand, some great Trusts in the West do not scruple sometimes to sell at a loss in order to put their weaker rivals out of business, and then bleed the unfortunate consumer.

Soviet exports undoubtedly hit other countries very hard. At the time of writing a small poultry farmer expected to get 1s. 6d. per lb. for his chickens, but was offered only 9d., as a quantity of Russian birds had come to market at this price. This farmer, who buys his poultry food by the ton, is made, nevertheless, to pay practically retail prices for it, although commodity prices are very depressed. The difference between wholesale and retail prices in this country is frequently outrageous. Some months ago the United States Government forbade the importation of wood pulp from Russia on the ground that it had been produced by practically forced labour. The mill-owners were up in arms at once. They declared they would have to shut down and so add to the already existing huge numbers of unemployed. The ban was lifted. The world cannot shut out Russian exports. The standard of living in Russia is shockingly low, but the very high standards in Western countries will probably have to be reduced from the top downwards. Some big importers in this

country buy cheaply in the Russian market. They label the goods 'Foreign Produce' instead of stating their origin, but do not always give even their retailers the benefit. The consumer, of course, has no say in the matter, although the whole nation consumes. Big Business has much to answer for.

The Soviet Customs Tariff has nothing to do with the subject of this article; but it throws some light on the Russian Government's mode of reasoning. The import of luxuries is forbidden as in Italy, but glacé kid is not classed as one. Its tariff is 400 per cent. *ad valorem*, whereas the duty on raw coffee is 500 per cent. Tea, the staple food, is heavily taxed, but aeroplanes are free in order to develop communication with distant places. The money value of Russian exports now substantially exceeds that of the imports. Trade is carried on with fifty-eight countries, the value of that with Germany being the largest. Great Britain comes next as regards the value of her imports, and is fourth on the list of exporters to Russia, but her exports are only about one-quarter of the value of Germany's or of those of the United States. Russia is an increasingly formidable competitor, and it is fortunate for Western nations that the designs of her rulers are considerably hampered by certain racial characteristics of her citizens.

The Communist Party itself and its executives certainly possess one very illuminating trait. Unlike members of capitalist Governments, they do not hesitate to criticise each other in their Press. This gives valuable information about the progress and prospects of the Five Years' Plan. One may pick up at random a copy of the Party's paper, 'Pravda,' and read, for instance, that fur garments and kid shoes have arrived at a railway station instead of the urgently needed cloth clothing and ordinary footwear. Each shipment had been despatched to the wrong destination, perhaps a thousand miles or more away. On the front page of 'Pravda' of Oct. 13, 1930, it was stated that 'ninety new locomotives were to have been erected in the first ten days of October, but not one was turned out.' The paragraph laments that it is 'very difficult to discover the guilty party.' In another issue there was an article with a four-column headline entitled 'Plain Facts.' It related to the

disorganisation in the distribution of everyday necessities as discovered by zealous—and probably hungry—investigators. There were no packing materials for foodstuffs. 'In No. 71, Red Commanders Street, hundreds of boxes and 130 new bags were found. They had been there for nearly a month.' Another case was that of a workman who wanted soap and went to No. 127, Printers Street, for it. 'He was told there was none. The searchers arrived immediately afterwards, and unearthed twenty-three cases of soap which had been delivered four days previously.' Complaints that 'costly machinery is ruined for lack of lubrication' are frequent. Much space was allotted in the 'Pravda' of Oct. 15, 1930, to lamentations over successful tax-evaders. These were, of course, winked at by the local authorities, who no doubt put personal gain by bribery before their obligations to the State. 'A *kulak*, by name Tarasov,' who had formerly farmed on a substantial scale, and still contrived to keep six cows and a horse, was assessed according to the standard rate. A neighbouring agricultural labourer, however, who had a small allotment but neither cow nor horse, was supertaxed to the amount of 110 roubles. 'In the Palkin district, during a period of four months, only ten peasant households had become collectivised. In other words, collectivisation has been brought almost to a standstill.' Another item states that 'thirty-nine *kulaks* (in another district) were fined a total of 15,000 roubles, but not one copeck of this sum has been recovered. Article 61 of the Code has not hitherto been carried out.' This is Russia yesterday and to-day. Wages and salaries are admittedly much too low. Stalin's is only about 300*l.* per annum, but he has certain other emoluments in kind. Peculation, when discovered, is punished with death.

The Soviet Government's path towards its ultimate goal, World Revolution, is therefore beset with obstacles. The frenzied rush often causes the most urgent needs of man to be neglected, while schedules of work cannot be punctually carried out owing to bad organisation and want of ordinary care. Dishonesty, sloth, misdirected zeal, verbiage, stupidity, hamper the GOSPLAN'S projects, and famine has not yet been extirpated. Pending the further development of State farming, scarcity of food

owing to crop failure has caused terrible suffering. In 1928, for instance, the area under cultivation was less by fifteen million acres than in the preceding year, owing to the crop failure in the Ukraine.

But notwithstanding its cruelty, faults, and blunders, nothing can stop the Russian Juggernaut. As change is the universal law of Nature, so its methods will be modified as time passes. However much one detests Sovietism in some of its aspects, Bolshevism has the germ of a great ideal, namely, the welfare of the entire population. It is laying, in a very crude form, the foundation of a new system, and if, as we are often told, some of our methods are archaic, we had better improve them in time. We hear much about placing townspeople on the land, but have done nothing to improve marketing conditions for those already on it. Our children are to remain at school until the age of fifteen. Numbers of them already attain the highest possible standard when they are twelve, and have not opportunities for learning more. The rest of the world cannot afford to ignore Russia, which is bound to make progress. The West is also unintentionally helping the Soviet Government, for its great Trusts are exploiting the consumer, who is already grumbling. The Russian principle, efficiently administered for the basic industries, would prevent wasteful competition, over-production, and consequent unemployment. Even now excess production might be largely absorbed if prices were lowered. In modern life the Trust system, either on Western or on Russian lines, is the sole one possible.

It is, however, only with a backward, indolent, superstitious, and very patient people that the experiment of the Soviet Government could ever have been attempted in such ruthless manner. Our people, at any rate, would at once have crushed such an attack on personal liberty. But the clash between Individualism and Collectivism has occurred. What is Big Business going to do? The problem is not how to demolish the Soviet and all its works, but how to meet it with improved methods and better propaganda.

W. H. H. WATERS.

Art. 7.—ROGER ASCHAM.

1. *Familiarium Epistolarum Libri Tres*. Edited with Latin poems and a Latin life by Edward Grant. 1576.
2. *The Scholemaster*. Edited by J. E. B. Mayor. Bell, 1863.
3. *Toxophilus*. Edited by Professor Arber. Arber's Reprints, Birmingham, 1865.
4. *Complete Works of Roger Ascham*. Edited by Dr Giles. Three vols. J. R. Smith, 1864-5.
5. *The Scholemaster*. Edited by Professor Arber. Arber's Reprints, Birmingham, 1870.
6. *English Works of Roger Ascham*. Edited by Wm. Aldis Wright. Cambridge University Press. 1904.
7. *Essays on Educational Reformers*. By R. H. Quick. Author, Redhill, 1868; Arnold, 1890.
8. *Roger Ascham*, in the *Dictionary of National Biography*, Vol. II. By Sidney Lee. 1885.

FOUR hundred years ago there went up to Cambridge a Yorkshire boy-student named Roger Ascham, who, though he never attained to the front rank of England's mighty men, yet won for himself a place of honour in English history as a maker of English literature and a minor builder of Elizabethan England. Ascham was born in days fraught with great movements in thought and life. More was writing the Latin original of *Utopia*. Erasmus was preparing his edition of the Greek New Testament for publication at Basel. Wolsey was keeping England at peace abroad, while he centralised administration and consolidated despotism at home. Luther was busy forging the thunderbolts of the Reformation.

Roger's only school was a tutor and a handful of boys under the roof of Sir Humphry Wingfield, lawyer, scholar, and sportsman. Thence at the age of fifteen he went in 1530 to St John's College, Cambridge. It was a new Cambridge. Greek was becoming popular and predominant, almost at the cost of Latin; and both were being taught more and more as literatures rather than as languages. The substance of ancient philosophy was taking the place of the forms of mediæval scholasticism; and law, medicine, and mathematics were entering upon the early scientific stage. Ascham fell

passionately in love with Greek under the attractive guidance of Sir John Cheke. 'To learn Greek more quickly, while still a boy, he taught Greek to boys.' In 1534 he was elected a Fellow of St John's, largely through the influence of the Master, Dr Nicholas Metcalfe, who generously forgave Ascham's anti-papal outbursts in undergraduate circles, though he did not forget to correct the young enthusiast who had spoken unadvisedly with his lips. Ascham calls his election his birthday; his fellowship was 'the whole foundation of the poor learning that I have.' Cambridge was then indeed a home of plain living and high thinking. Thomas Nash, a generation later, recalls the memory of the many candles lighted in Johnian studies before four o'clock in the morning. Ascham was a tireless worker; his only recreation was the archery permitted by college and university statutes. He lectured on Greek and mathematics, studied music, took private pupils, and practised the beautiful handwriting which made him the first scribe of his day. His command of Latin and English led to his appointment as official letter-writer to the college and the university, and in 1546 he succeeded Cheke as public orator. Meanwhile Cambridge had nearly lost him. In 1542 dissensions in university life threatened the peace and progress of learning, and Ascham's father advised him to leave Cambridge. He applied for incorporation at Oxford, but did not pursue his application. In 1544 he was looking, almost asking, for a post on the staff of a foreign embassy, and did actually ask the Secretary of State to secure for him the Regius Professorship of Greek soon to be vacated by Cheke. Meanwhile he was busy writing his 'Toxophilus,' which he revised carefully and finally published in 1545. In 1547 he proposed to deliver a public disputation on the vexed question of the Mass from the standpoint of a reformer. The Vice-Chancellor forbade the use of the public schools for the purpose, and Ascham delivered his soul by writing a treatise which never saw the light until it was published by his friends after his death. Ascham was not made of martyr stuff. In 1541 he sent a Latin translation of a Greek patristic commentary on St Paul to his patron Archbishop Lee of York. The work was returned with a present of money and a reprimand

for his advocacy of the marriage of the clergy. In one letter to his Grace Ascham promised to abandon theology for classics; in another he protested that he was 'no seeker after novelties,' and referred to his lectures in proof of his innocence. He succeeded in retaining the patronage of Bishop Gardiner, and in obtaining and retaining secretarial office in the service of three sovereigns, Edward, Mary, and Elizabeth.

Ill-health had twice compelled Ascham to leave Cambridge. The strain of scholarly poverty and perhaps of religious crisis weighed heavily upon him; and in 1548 he left Cambridge to become tutor to Princess Elizabeth, then just fifteen. Ascham and Elizabeth were old friends. Since she was twelve he had often written her letters of advice and encouragement with regard to her studies, once mended her silver pen, and sent her a present of an Italian book and a manual of prayers. His new tutorship lasted barely two years. Something in the domestic situation or the social atmosphere proved uncongenial, and in 1550 Ascham resigned his post and went back to Cambridge, which he left again shortly for three years' service abroad as secretary to Sir Richard Morysin, English ambassador to the Imperial Court. The recall of the embassy on the death of Edward VI left Ascham once more stranded; but Gardiner procured him the position of Latin Secretary to the English Court, which he held all through Mary's troublous reign and after the accession of Elizabeth. In 1554 his marriage to Margaret Howe terminated his fellowship, and he exchanged his college home for a home of his own. It was a happy home, but its finances were precarious; and his gratitude to royal and noble patrons sometimes has a pardonably anticipatory ring. Meanwhile Ascham found time during his secretaryship under Mary to pay occasional visits to her sister Elizabeth, and to continue to guide her studies, and in particular to read Greek with her. It must have been a happy relief and refreshment to finish a Latin translation of Cardinal Pole's speech as papal legate in Parliament for transmission to the Pope, and to pack his humble kit for a day or two of Demosthenes with the scholarly princess who found peace and pleasure in classical learning amid the difficulties and dangers of her own

position. When she came to the throne at the age of twenty-five, this amazing young woman, confronted with yet greater difficulties and dangers at home and abroad, still found time and inclination to read the Greek New Testament, Cyprian and Melancthon for guidance in churchmanship, and Æschines and Cicero for scholarship's sake, under the tuition of her Latin secretary in the hours that could be spared from duties of state, with an occasional break in their studies for a game of chess. In his 'Scholemaster' Ascham shames 'the young gentlemen of England' with the example of the scholar maid upon the throne.

'Point forth six of the best gentlemen of this court, and they all together . . . bestow not so many hours, daily, orderly and constantly, for the increase of knowledge and learning, as doth the Queen's Majesty herself. Yea, I believe that beside her perfect readiness in Latin, Italian, French, and Spanish, she readeth here now at Windsor more Greek every day than some prebendary of the Church doth read Latin in a whole week.'

Sir Richard Sackville once called Ascham 'the scholar of the best master (viz. Cheke) and the schoolmaster of the best scholar (viz. Elizabeth) that ever were in our time.' It is a new light on Gloriana to see her as the complete student. The tutor's tribute to his royal pupil is matched by her tribute to him. When she heard of his death, she broke out impulsively: 'I would rather have cast ten thousand pounds into the sea than have lost my Ascham.' In a true sense he died on her service; the month of fatal sickness at the end of 1568 began with an all-night sitting over a Latin poem which he wanted to present to her on Nov. 17, the anniversary of her accession.

Ascham's service abroad as secretary to Morysin bore fruit in a book which he entitled 'A Report of the Affairs and State of Germany,' at once a diary of travel and a survey of European politics with a historical value of its own. But it bore far richer fruit in a harvest of letters, some in Latin, some in English, the latter the firstfruits of a new type of English literature. Ascham lost no opportunity of meeting European scholars, exploring historic sites and observing continental

institutions. It was a great experience for an English scholar to read Thucydides, Polybius, and Livy afresh in their bearing on French and German politics. But pure scholarship was not neglected. Ascham and his chief read Herodotus in the morning and Sophocles or Euripides in the afternoon four days a week, and sometimes Demosthenes. On other days Ascham was engaged in official correspondence; in one spell of three days he penned forty-seven letters to 'princes and personages of whom cardinals were the lowest.' At night he brought his diary up to date, arranged his notes on foreign affairs, and wrote private letters to friends in England, the best of them to old companions in study at St John's. There is something pathetic in the wistfulness of the scholar whose heart was still in college. He writes from Augsburg to the Fellows of St John's of the happiness that he finds 'in talking with you, in being at home for a while in St John's from whence my heart can never be absent'; and again in the same letter, 'I would I were at your problem-fire when you read this letter; then would I desire Mr Dean and Mr Leaver to remit the scholars a day of punishment that they might remember me, that can forget none of that house, praying God to make them all virtuous and learned, and especially in the Greek tongue.' Most pathetic of all is his confession in a letter from Brussels to Cecil in 1553: 'Having now some experience of life led at home and abroad, and knowing what I can do most fitly and how I would live most gladly, I do well perceive there is no such quietness in England nor pleasure in strange countries as even in St John's College, to keep company with the Bible, Plato, Aristotle, Demosthenes, and Tully.'

The letter just quoted contains a curious elaboration of Ascham's theory of the functions of a university. It begins with a request for Cecil's help in obtaining a readership in Greek at Cambridge. But the request widens out into a protest against the neglect of pure scholarship and science in favour of professional studies, a protest not unnecessary in our own time. He has heard that the Visitors have made the study of divinity or law or physick compulsory.

'In remembering England abroad, they have in mine opinion forgotten Cambridge itse.f. For if some be not suffered

in Cambridge to make the fourth order, that is, freely as they list to study the tongues and sciences, the other three shall be neither so many as they should, nor yet so good and pleasant as they might. For law, physic, and divinity need so the help of tongues and sciences as they cannot want them; and yet they require so a man's whole study, as he may part with no time to other learning, except it be at certain times, to fetch it at other men's labour. I know universities be instituted only that the realm may be served with preachers, lawyers, and physicians; and so I know likewise all woods are planted only there for building or burning; and yet good husbandmen do use not to cut all down for timber and fuel, but leave always standing some big one to be the defence of the new spring. Therefore if some were so planted in Cambridge, as they should neither be carried away to some other place, nor decay there for lack of living, nor be bound to profess no one of the three, but bend themselves wholly to help forward all, I believe preachers, lawyers, and physicians should spring in number and grow in bigness more than commonly they do.'

Ascham's first great work was a treatise on archery, to which he gave the classical title 'Toxophilus,' 'the lover of the bow.' According to Dr Johnson its origin was mercenary. 'The purse of Ascham was not equal to the expense of peregrination'; so he wrote a patriotic book to get a pension out of Henry VIII. But there was a nobler motive behind the book. Ascham loved England, and was convinced that the decline of archery as a fashionable pastime and a popular recreation spelt danger to national defence and also to national character. 'Toxophilus' was not merely a literary venture; it was a patriotic manifesto. It is not yet obsolete as a manual for the complete archer. But it has a larger value in other directions. It is a technical treatise which in the process of writing rose into a contribution to English literature. It is 'a monument of the system of national defence in Tudor times,' a 'prototype of the volunteer movement' of the nineteenth century. Above all, it is a self-portrait of a scholar and a sportsman whose patriotism and piety found joint expression in his prayers that the men of England,

'Through Christ, King Henry, the Book and the Bow,
May all manner of enemies quite overthrow.'

The book is cast in the form of a Platonic dialogue between

Philotoxus and Philologus, the sportsman and the scholar, the bowman and the bookman. Philotoxus insists that 'the best wits to learning must needs have much recreation and ceasing from their book, or else they mar themselves, when base and dumpish wits can never be hurt with continual study,' and compares these superior intelligences to the finer strings of a lute or the more resilient type of bow. Philotoxus proceeds to compare and criticise various games from the point of view of their value or appropriateness to the student, and awards the first prize to archery. In the 'Scholemaster,' where he has in view the training of the courtier or the gentleman, Ascham commends a long list of recreations 'containing either some fit exercise for war or some pleasant pastime for peace.' Camden says that Ascham was 'too much addicted to dicing and cock-matches,' and that was why he 'lived and died a poor man.' Andrew Lang remarks that 'in his attack on gambling in his "Toxophilus" he shows a rather unholy knowledge of all the tricks of the dice-board,' and mischievously suggests that probably he had paid dearly for his education in this art. There is a passage in the 'Scholemaster' in which Ascham seems to be answering some such imputations. He says that he is going to deal more fully with the pastimes of a gentleman in a book on the Cockpit, 'to satisfy some, I trust, with some reason, that be more curious in marking other men's doings than careful in mending their own faults.'

'It is well known that I like and love, and have always and do yet still use all exercises and pastimes that be fit for my nature and hability. And beside natural disposition, in judgment also, I was never either Stoick in doctrine or Anabaptist in religion, to mislike a merry, pleasant, and playful nature, if no outrage be committed against law, measure, or good order' (Mayor, p. 57).

The origin of the 'Scholemaster,' upon which Ascham's fame chiefly rests, is described in the preface. Late in 1563 Cecil, principal Secretary of State, nine members of the Privy Council or officers of the Exchequer, and Ascham, were dining together in Cecil's room at Windsor. Cecil began to talk about the news that 'divers scholars of Eton be run away from the school for fear of beating.'

A brisk discussion on school discipline ensued. Ascham suggested that 'young children were sooner allured by love than driven by beating to attain good learning.' Sir Richard Sackville listened silently, but afterwards asked Ascham to find a schoolmaster for his little grandson and Ascham's son, and to write a book on education. Ascham lay awake that night thinking over his friend's request, and finally decided 'to prepare some little treatise for a New Year's gift that Christmas . . . but as it chanceth to busy builders, so in building this my poor schoolhouse . . . the work rose daily higher and wider than I thought it would at the beginning.' It was just finished when he died five years later, and was published in 1570 by his widow, with a preface of dedication to Cecil. 'In writing this book,' says Ascham, 'I have had earnest respect to three special points, truth of religion, honesty in living, right order in learning.' It is divided into two chapters, the first 'teaching the bringing up of youth,' the second 'teaching the ready way to the Latin tongue.' The chief feature of the second chapter is its insistence on the method of teaching the art of writing Latin by the double process of translation into English and retranslation into Latin. The book was intended as a guide both to schoolmasters and to private students; and Ascham's royal pupil is cited as the shining example of the efficacy of the method.

The first chapter deals with education in general. It is open to the criticism that it does not distinguish adequately between the child and the youth. But Ascham was constantly seeing the man in the boy and the boy in the man. Like Sir Thomas Elyot's 'Governor,' a still earlier educational classic, the 'Scholemaster' starts from a practical standpoint of national need, and that is the fact that England was losing much moral and intellectual capacity through failing to give its youth a proper training. This failure Ascham traces back to five causes. (1) The first is the cruelty of school discipline. Boys are handled more roughly than colts. 'They find fear and bondage in schools; they feel liberty and freedom in stables; which causeth them utterly to abhor the one and most gladly to haunt the other.' (2) The second is the neglect or rather the mishandling of slower pupils. 'A wise schoolmaster should rather consider discreetly

the right disposition of both their natures (i.e. the slow and the quick learner), and not so much weigh what either of them is able to do now, as what either of them is likely to do hereafter.' Ascham prefers the slow mind that ripens late. He sees a close connection between quick minds and unstable manners, and between slow wits and solid characters. Incidentally he voices the ancient and modern grievance of the scholar against the scientist. Such sciences, he says, as arithmetic and geometry and (strange to say) music, 'as they sharpen men's wits overmuch, so they change men's manners over sore, if they be not moderately mingled, and wisely applied to some good use of life.' The mathematician is the worst offender. 'Mark all mathematical heads which be only and wholly bent to those sciences, how solitary they be in themselves, how unfit to live with others, and how unapt to serve in the world.' (3) The third is the decay of home discipline, or the excess and abuse of youthful liberty. Ascham is gravely anxious for the future of England, unless her coming leaders learn to bear the yoke of obedience in their boyhood. (4) Another cause is the low estimate of the teaching profession. Men who talk as though they set a high value upon education will gladly give the trainer of their stud two hundred crowns a year, and grudge the tutor of their children his two hundred shillings. (5) The last and worst cause is the corrupting influence of foreign travel. Ascham points and laments the contrast between the lead that Italy and Rome once gave to the world in learning and life, and the debased and debasing tone of present Italian society and literature. Reformer, puritan, scholar, gentleman, tutor, prophet—he is all in turn, but always the Englishman who loves England. He quotes Italian testimony to the fact that the Englishman when he let himself go in Italy out-Italianed the Italian: *Inglese Italianato e un diavolo incarnato*. At the same time he lays urgent stress upon a wider peril—the abdication of moral leadership on the part of the social leaders of English life. 'You be indeed makers or marrers of all men's manners within the realm.' In a time of new and better legislation and administration he warns the ruling classes of the danger of divorce between principle and practice: 'all your laws, all your authority, all your commandments do not half so much

with mean men as doth your example and manner of living.' In a time of ecclesiastical reconstruction he insists upon the necessity of a personal conviction that shall at once express and awaken moral enthusiasm : 'infinite shall be made cold by your example that were never hurt by reading of books.' In a time of national crisis he demands the public service of the younger aristocracy. 'Commonly the meaner men's sons come to be the wisest counsellors and greatest doers in the weighty affairs of this realm. And why? for God will have it so of His providence; because ye will have it no otherwise by your negligence' (Mayor, p. 40).

The revival of letters gave to education a spirit of humanism which has been aptly described as a return to nature. Ascham was a pupil rather than a pioneer of the new educational school. Early in the sixteenth century, Castiglioni, in his '*Il Cortegiano*,' had sketched the ideal education of the young courtier. In England, Erasmus had recommended graduated physical training for boys until the age of seven, and only then their introduction to book-learning, and had insisted upon small classes as the only effective way of teaching. Colet, Dean of St Paul's, had founded St Paul's School, with Lilly for its first headmaster, and there the ideas of Erasmus were put into practice. More, in his '*Utopia*,' had given education to every child in the community, and urged the teaching of English as an instrument of thought, and the study of science with less dependence upon classical authority. The Reformation itself was an educational as well as a religious movement. There was much common ground between reformers and humanists. Both were fighting for liberty as against ecclesiastical authority. Both regarded Greek with reverence; it was the key to the New Testament as well as to ancient learning. But the two movements soon drifted apart. Humanism was an entirely literary development, and aimed at the highest intellectual culture for the few: Protestantism with Luther at its head became the champion of popular education. Melancthon, the real founder of German education, with the help of his friend Joachim Camerarius, set to work to build up the elementary schools into the classical schools known as *gymnasias*. John Sturm, rector of the gymnasium at Strassburg, was

a dear friend and correspondent of Ascham, who tells us that he owed much of the contents of his 'Scholemaster' to Sir John Cheke and to John Sturm. Ascham, however, was no mere product of the new movement in education. It found in him both an exponent and a promoter. For a generation he was the recognised authority in England. The licence issued in 1581 for the publication of the 'Positions' of Mulcaster, headmaster of St Paul's School, provides that 'if this book contain anything prejudicial or hurtful to the Book of Master Ascham called the "Scholemaster," then this licence be void.' Dr Garnett is probably right in thinking that the reason why Ascham's two chief works passed out of the mind of later generations was simply that they had done their work so well. Ascham has since come into his own again. Quick, in his 'Educational Reformers,' couples him with Locke and Herbert Spencer as the 'only three English writers on education who have caught the ear of other nations.'

The 'Scholemaster' has three great merits. (1) It presents in attractive form a wise and happy application of some of the new principles and methods of the educational reform of his day. Space forbids illustration in detail. But it should be noted that the method of retranslation not only teaches how to write Latin prose: it teaches the values of English words and the distinctive features of English syntax. One other judgment of Ascham's should be noted. While recognising the value of epitomes or abstracts from ancient or modern authors, he insists that they are no substitute for the study of the authors themselves, a warning still necessary in these days of outline manuals for examinands. (2) The 'Scholemaster' and 'Toxophilus' both illustrate the happy combination of scholarship and sport which has been characteristic of English education ever since. England owes an unpayable debt to Ascham and the other men who 'superintended the transition from monastic to lay studies' in the first half of the sixteenth century. Professor Strong rightly remarks that some of Ascham's ideas 'recall Plato and anticipate Ruskin.' He may have been indebted to Italian thinkers as well as to Plato, but he is entitled to a credit of his own for the way in which he works out 'the place of physical grace and vigour in personality.' At one point he made

literary history. The first point in his ideal pupil is that he is *euphues*, i.e. comely. To the 'Scholemaster' John Lyly owed both the name and the substance of his 'Euphues' or 'Anatomy of Wit' published in 1579. (3) A still more striking feature of Ascham's educationalism is its nationalism. It is English in tone and outlook throughout. Its aim is to produce the complete and perfect Englishman. 'Ascham's nationalism,' says a critic in the Cambridge History of English Literature, 'which inspires every paragraph of "Toxophilus," is but characteristic of English humanism of the finer type. Elyot, Smith, Cheke and Hoby are Englishmen first and men of scholarship next. . . . The "Scholemaster" is essentially the work of a scholar who has no illusions on the subject of Erasmian cosmopolitanism.' The same critic observes justly that 'there is a note of reality in writings on education which were written or which found a welcome in England,' a note which is lacking in German and Italian educational literature. That reality is not merely the practical simplicity of common sense: it is the unformulated and unforgettable sense of duty, the silent consciousness that scholarship and sport are means to an end, and that end is service, the service of God and Queen and country.

Ascham had his critics in his own day. They wanted to know why he chose 'to spend time,' as he puts it, 'in writing of trifles, as the school of shooting, the Cockpit, and this book of the first principles of grammar, rather than to take some weighty matters in hand, either of religion or civil discipline.' This criticism was pardonable at the time. It was a day of acute ecclesiastical and political controversy. It would not be true to say that Ascham cared for none of these things, though he did not care for them fiercely enough to play the martyr or the persecutor. It would be truer to say that he was far more anxiously concerned to train Englishmen to read and to think—far more firmly convinced that the supreme necessity of the present was to lay for the future of his country a solid foundation of sound learning and steady living. He preferred modest construction to immoderate controversy. It was the instinctive judgment of a scholar in an age of crisis, fraught with problems and perils which would demand of all future citizens and

churchmen more than their education was yet ripe to supply. Ascham's task, as he saw it, was to contribute to their education. It was a true estimate of his own powers and therefore of his responsibilities. The 'Scholemaster' is worth ten of the books that his critics expected him to write on the burning questions of the day.

Ascham had his limitations. He was no expert in poetry or in poetical criticism. He caught the fashion, then prevalent at St John's, of imitating Greek and Latin metres. He tried his hand at English hexameters, in which short vowels were forced into an artificial quantity of position. The few surviving specimens of his handiwork relieve us of any regret over the loss of the rest. Ascham himself doubted after all whether hexameters are possible in English. He joined in the attack on rhyming verse, which he attributed to 'the Huns and Gothians and other barbarous nations of ignorance and rude singularity.' 'I am sure,' he says, 'that our English tongue will receive *carmen iambicum*.' He was right so far. There was rich promise in the iambic measures of his ill-fated contemporary, the young Earl of Surrey, the first writer of English blank verse. But Dr Garnett neatly remarks that 'Surrey would have looked blanker than his verse at a proposal to re-write his lyrics in blank verse.'

In one direction Ascham was a pioneer, and a successful pioneer. He is 'the first English exemplar of polished epistolary correspondence.' The 'Paston Letters,' which throw a flood of light on English domestic and social life in the fifteenth century, were purely private letters, never expected to become a treasure of English literature. Ascham's letters here and there read almost as though the writer had perhaps a wider circle of readers in view. It was no mere personal remembrance, but a true sense of literary value, which led to the publication of four editions of the letters before the end of Elizabeth's reign. They reflect the life of their age, but also the mind of their writer; and they mark a distinct stage in the development of the English language—it is getting into its stride.

Indeed, Ascham's chief title to fame is his share in the making of the English language into an instrument of thought and expression. It was a venture of faith and courage. His explanation in 'Toxophilus' of his choice of English instead of Latin is not an apology, a confession

of fault; it is rather an *apologia*, a confession of faith. He believed profoundly in the present possibilities and the future progress of the English language. His choice was confirmed by experience and reflection. His earlier letters, even to ladies and to friends, were written in Latin; but the later half of his nearly three hundred extant letters are in English. And in the 'Scholemaster' there is neither apology nor *apologia*. He has won control of his instrument; there is a marked advance in his style. And he seems conscious that he has won the battle for the English language. This was, perhaps, the supreme service that Ascham rendered to his country. He does not indeed stand alone in this attempt to explore and exhibit the latent capacities of the English language. Even the English writers whom he dismisses somewhat contemptuously in 'Toxophilus' were moving consciously or unconsciously towards the same goal. It was not merely a literary movement; it was a phase and stage of culture in the widest sense. The movement was fundamentally patriotic rather than philosophical, national rather than literary. English nationality had been formed slowly by the fusion of races, by the conflict of powers within the realm and of policies without the realm, by the growing sense of unity in the life of the nation and of independence in the face of other nations. This fact of nationality burst into activity in the sixteenth century in a new consciousness of nationalism. The reign of Elizabeth was perhaps the most formative age in English history. It was the age of the arrival of the Englishman, conscious of a difference between himself and other nations, and conscious of a distinctive place and work in the world. Some Englishmen grasped the new situation more clearly; they felt that their nation had a contribution of its own to make to the knowledge and the thought of the world, and that their experience of life must find an expression in letters. England must be able to speak and to write as well as to think and to act. Among these nationalists in literature Ascham won and kept a foremost place.

Ascham fashioned for himself a style of his own as his contribution to English literature. He did more for English prose than any Elizabethan writer except Hooker. But Hooker's 'Ecclesiastical Polity' is as majestic in

style as it is momentous in content. Ascham's strength lies in his simplicity. It has been called a strained simplicity, and here and there it does seem deliberate; but even where *ars latet arte sua*, the result is a simplicity that justifies the effort. And mostly it is the instinctive simplicity of a man writing as naturally as he talks, though more carefully. The vocabulary is as simple as the style. Ascham was too much of a scholar to imagine that it was possible or necessary to avoid words of classical origin. But by a wise discrimination he manages to draw upon classical vocabularies without classicising his own. Two modest luxuries of style he does permit himself. He likes to avail himself occasionally of 'alliteration's artful aid,' and of the balancing of clauses by way of parallel or antithesis; and sometimes he combines alliteration and antithesis with telling effect. Dr Garnett justly concludes his estimate of Ascham with the remark that if his immediate objects were so completely attained that his influence has departed, 'his charm remains: he cannot be read anywhere without pleasure.'

LEWIS B. RADFORD,
Bishop of Goulburn, N.S.W.

Art. 8.—THE DAWN OF MODERN FARMING.

1. *The Winthrop Papers*, Vol. I, 1498–1628. Massachusetts Historical Society, 1929.
2. *The Economic and Social History of an English Village*. By N. S. B. and E. C. Gras. Harvard Economic Studies, 1930.
3. *The Account Book of a Kentish Estate, 1616–1704*. By Eleanor C. Lodge. British Academy Publications: Oxford Press, 1927.
4. *Introduction to the Rolls of Norwich Cathedral Priory*. By H. W. Saunders. Jarrold, 1930.

It may seem a startling proposition that the trite comparison of truth and fiction is founded on sound tradition. A miracle or nine days' wonder may have happened before, only to be forgotten before it happens again. We are warned by 'professed historians' not to assume that History 'repeats itself'; but we ought to consider the scope of its study as well as the significance of its interpretation. From time to time the discovery of long-buried treasure in the shape of an intimate narrative of the daily life and occupation of some typical ancestor has caused no little stir in the learned but conventional world of letters. Our historians have been apt to wait upon the leisurely progress of research; but our methods are being speeded up by the eager band of American researchers equipped by American institutions which generously provide the much-needed funds for organised investigation. So what has happened before might easily happen again; and it has, in fact, happened in a case which will be presently explored by the discovery of the farm journal of a Jacobean yeoman which forms the subject of the present article. But first its title must be justified by a brief survey of the condition of English agriculture before the close of the sixteenth century.

From pre-Conquest times to the close of the Middle Age the plough had made its way slowly outside the narrow English village field, in the face of uncleared wood-lands and unreclaimed moor-lands; while the co-operative labour of the feudal landlord and his tenants had been rewarded by a bare subsistence, for as yet this primitive husbandry had only been supplemented to a slight extent

by exploiting the natural resources of the soil ; nor was it yet organised as an industrial enterprise to meet the requirements of the urban consumer. Under Anglo-Saxon, Norman, and Plantagenet Kings alike the plough was recognised as the symbol of national prosperity, and was utilised as the basis of national taxation and feudal surveys. But already, in the later Middle Age, we find the plough-lands shrinking and the plough-teams idle ; for the taxing of the ploughs to wage the King's wars and the grazing of sheep to enrich agrarian adventurers and foreign middle-men threatened the destruction of English husbandry.

It is true that the national wealth and credit were rapidly increasing with the development of mercantile adventure, and thereby the revenue from land could be largely supplemented. Before the end of the Twelfth Century the King, as chief lord of feudal England, had attracted to his courts a considerable revenue from the issues of justice (levied largely for the security of person and property), while he had increased his land revenues through the operation of feudal incidents. He had ceased, too, for some time past, to defray the expenses of his kingly state from products of the soil, and during the next three centuries he led the way in prodigal expenditure, though he was still able to supply a considerable proportion of household stores by means of his ancient prerogative of purveyance. The Wardrobe Accounts have preserved damning evidence of this extravagance : costly clothing and equipment for elaborate feats of chivalry or venery, with maintenance of an innumerable retinue in numerous royal residences ; with a still more costly expenditure on the half-fanatical, half-chivalrous, and wholly barbarous warfare waged by the lord King of England against Saracen hordes in Palestine, a feudal overlord in France and feudal subjects in Scotland, Ireland, and Wales, or against refractory lieges in England itself. And after war came famine ; and after famine came pestilence and ' God's three arrows ' or His ' triple scourge,' as these visitations were pitifully called.

The lay and ecclesiastical landlords followed suit, as far as their means allowed ; a few manors being reserved for supplying the lord's bake-house and the rest leased to farmers paying money rents, the further re-

quirements of the lord's household and estate being provided from the surplus live stock and natural resources of the manors at large. The transition was facilitated by the fact that the lord's arable lands lay for the most part in the common fields, side by side with those of the tenants, who for generations past had cultivated them under the supervision of the lord's bailiff and the village reeve. Moreover, the manorial organisation remained available, together with the capital invested in seed-corn, plough-teams, manure, and farm buildings, while the live stock was usually pastured under the supervision of the lord's officers. The alternative policy of leasing some or all of their demesnes is supposed to have been suggested to landlords, after the Black Death, by the increasing difficulty of meeting the requirements of tillage; and in view of these or other unfavourable conditions (especially the increased cost of labour), most of the manors were let before the middle of the Fifteenth Century. The fact is that the lord needed, like the King, a largely increased revenue, in cash, to defray the expenses and extravagances of a new age. With this fact we may perhaps couple the Fourteenth Century landlord's recognition of another—that arable farming was a highly skilled and also a somewhat risky undertaking, which could scarcely be made to pay if it were carried on according to the conventional subsistence régime.

The early system of 'field' partnership, superseded by the more businesslike land-and-stock leases perfected by William of Wykeham as surveyor of Crown lands, was based on the 'wainage' or profit of land sown 'to-halves,' or on some other terms, whereby manorial officers or tenants were charged with the production of certain grain crops at a fixed rate of yield, and this ratio came to be regarded as a test whereby profit or loss on the tillage of the demesne or of any outlying holdings could be ascertained; and when the prospect was not favourable we may find it noted in the bailiff's accounts that a farm was unlet because 'none cared to sow this year on those terms.' But as even the most doleful chronicler is able to record years of plenty interspersed with the lean years, the idea of fixity of tenure came to be regarded as the reasonable basis of an adventure which was made possible by the co-operation

of capital and labour. And so potential profits during a term of five, seven, or twenty-one years are shared by the landlord with a tenant farmer; the former contributing his plough-team with the first year's seed, and the latter undertaking to replace and maintain this stock, to cultivate the land properly, and to pay a certain yearly rent as interest for the use of land and stock. The wisdom and the equity of this transaction have often been discussed by historians and publicists, and it has been generally assumed that lords of manors went out of the business of demesne farming when it was no longer possible to utilise the labour of customary tenants and serfs. It should, however, be remembered that the cash profits of mediæval farming were comparatively small, after the necessary subsistence had been provided for the lord's family and retinue, and for the stipends of his manorial staff, with occasional labour from the village. For subsistence, in the shape of meat and drink and the elaborate maintenance of buildings, game preserves and fish-ponds, was the chief object of the manorial economy, and as such was responsible for the upkeep of a large range of domestic offices and substantial farm buildings. These, in fact, were necessary because corn, live stock, and game had not only to be protected from freebooters, beasts of prey, and vermin, but also prepared for consumption without the assistance of various 'tradesmen.' The place of these was taken by manorial or household officers whose departmental accounts were periodically examined and audited.

To understand the reaction in favour of tillage that gathered strength during the second half of the Sixteenth Century, we have to take into account some human and social factors which perhaps have not been fully realised. One reason for the omission may be that the conflicting interests of producers, distributors and consumers, and the urge of individual enterprise or want have scarcely been sufficiently considered. Another obvious reason is that no documentary evidence is now available as to the economic and social circumstances in which the demesne lands taken over from the management of bailiffs or obedientiaries were worked by tenant farmers. The ever-widening divergence of economic and social interests between producers and consumers in country and town,

respectively, is reflected in legislative enactments and administrative directions from the Thirteenth Century onwards. The cause of this antagonism may be found in a conflict of interests which must always exist between agrarian and urban industrialists. But there was this difference between the conditions of the earlier and later times respectively. In the first place, the food available from native sources of supply was practically limited to corn of the last harvest, until the next harvest came to hand. For bread was then in very truth the staff of life, and was the only 'meat' available for the poor; though its constituents and quality might vary (as with us), and it might also be consumed, as meat and drink combined, in the form of ale or beer.

The results of this precarious food supply are seen in frequent visitations of dearth and even famine, followed by pestilence and murrain which caused much anxiety to the Government and hampered the economic and social development of the country. For centuries past landowners and peasants had gambled on the chance of escaping flood or drought or murrain without the protection afforded by modern scientific precautions. Indeed, complete disaster had only been avoided by a profusion of flocks tended by a scanty population inured to hunger: for though the discipline of tillage was admittedly essential, the welfare of the country-side was being endangered by the conversion of tillage into pasture—without the excuse that may be found in later times for the conversion of pasture to tillage. Perhaps we have scarcely realised the danger of this situation because we have not all the materials for reconstructing it. Whether the Tillage acts and ordinances of Tudor parliaments and councils, enforced by judicial decisions, helped to save the situation is now a matter of opinion; but it is evident from contemporary records and literature that the much-worn safety-valve of the wastage of human life was still operating freely.

Scarcity of food was further aggravated by the manipulation of food values through the persistent use of customary weights and measures forbidden by successive acts and ordinances from the Great Charter to our own time. By means of these abuses local and even metropolitan profiteers were able to buy cheap and sell dear,

while those unable to buy cheaply sold still more dearly ; for ' to make their profit ' (according to ancient custom) meant to make a dishonest living, at the expense of the producer and consumer alike, by buying with a ' large bushel ' and selling with a smaller one. In spite, however, of the denunciations of Church and State, these harpies continued to be regarded as a necessary evil, which had not wholly disappeared within living memory.

The early race of subsistence farmers included, as we have seen, the landlords themselves, whose bailiffs were expected to supply a sufficiency of provisions for ' the lord's hospice ' and ' courtyard,' disposing of the remaining produce of the demesne to the best advantage offered by the need of villeins or the greed of victuallers. Alternatively with this system, and latterly in succession to it, were the ' farmers,' the mystery men with land-and-stock leases, who managed to make both ends meet because rack-rents were practically unknown, and because, too, prices were moving steadily upwards in response to local scarcity, corn laws and depreciation of currency.

In the new England that emerged from a dark age of agrarian stagnation, the commercial outlook of all who lived by the land was still further improved by the action of supply and demand, as seen in a keen traffic in land values and in a wider scope of marketing, which with other economic and social changes were steadily undermining the foundations of subsistence farming. Corn had for some time past acquired an independent value in relation to the official market price and the Assize of Bread and Ale, the significance of this market price being enhanced by the contrast of subsistence values retained in connection with customary rents and feudal requisitions. At the same time, the creation of a new series of prices for butcher's meat, fruit, hops, wood, and sea-coal seems to point to the more profitable disposal of other products of the soil.

It would be a mistake to suppose that this momentous appreciation of prices and depreciation of rents exalted the lowly tenant farmer unduly or left his landlord to wallow in a slough of agricultural despondency, for patriarchal if not feudal relations remained outwardly unaltered. But it might also be a mistake to assume, without further proof, that both landlords and tenants

were incapable of dealing with the changed economic conditions for which a new race of business or professional landowners was now better equipped. In the first place, the cult of the land has remained through the ages a natural religion; and it is a cult that, in the long run, has rewarded the zeal and devotion of its followers, even though the State should intervene on behalf of vested interests. Thus one class of landowner, the ancient colleges, with many widely scattered manors on their bursars' books, was assisted by a pious Act in 1576, which enabled them to claim part payment of rents in wheat and malt. Other landlords were able to grant new leases on more advantageous terms, and to tap the natural wealth of the soil in wood-lands, mines and quarries, or to exploit its acquired value in building sites and means of communication. But in connection with agriculture itself the time had come when new methods and special endeavours were required to meet an increased expenditure by an increased production. The cost of living had risen with the standard of living, and this was the burden of the complaints of all who lived by the land, and who kept an account of their transactions, though not all of them had shouldered the heavy burden that every successful farmer, whether lord, gentleman, yeoman, or tenant, must bear. Some of the old régime of landlords stood at bay against pressing creditors or designing litigants. Others were content to eke out a depleted rent-roll by subsistence farming. The places of many feudatories whom feudalism had destroyed were taken by courtiers endowed with the spoils of political or religious persecution—by successful lawyers, and by merchants who might or might not have made large profits out of official contracts. But already, besides these manor lords, a large body of substantial yeomen was engaged in husbandry, ready to advance their fortunes on the land by grubbing rather than by grabbing, relying on their own skill as 'husbands' and no longer 'customaries.'

It is well known that commutation of *prædial* services and compulsory residence within the manors in return for fines, together with sales of outlying portions of the *demesnes* improved the condition of free and customary tenants equally. It is, however, noticeable that although the bailiff and the steward continued to supervise and

account for manors that were let to tenant farmers, no accounts of the farming operations of these lessees of the demesne lands have been preserved. This deficiency is the real cause of the serious difficulty experienced by economic and social historians in tracing the provenance and activities of the yeoman farmer between the Fourteenth and the Seventeenth Centuries, when accounts of yeoman farmers are occasionally preserved with those of squires, parsons, and churchwardens. For the mediæval period there is a great wealth and variety of accounts rendered by the appropriate accountants. Of these the clerical type is represented not only by lay manorial officers as 'bailiffs' of sorts, but also by the conventual monk-bailiff or other obedientiaries and the academic bursars. The mercantile type of accountant is represented by officers who as clerks with legal or business training, might be 'servants' of established merchants or even ministers of the Crown. In this connection we should bear in mind the derivation of our 'yeomanry' from the mediæval 'varlets' (valetti) who, as successively apprentices, yeomen, and factors of merchants of repute, were also their potential partners or successors, though rated till then as 'servants.' Copyhold tenants were also closely associated with tillage or 'husbandry' from the middle of the Sixteenth Century.

The plough itself, which still remained alike the instrument and symbol of agriculture, reappears in the didactic treatises of Tusser and Gervase Markham in the same cumbrous form as that which has been pieced together by the Editor of *Piers Plowman*. Unfortunately, these expositions cannot be illustrated by surviving specimens, but they can still be identified in vocabularies of agrarian terms compiled from manorial and household accounts and inventories preserved in public or private archives. From these and other sources it is possible to reconstruct the primitive methods and apparatus of demesne and leasehold farming from the Twelfth to the Sixteenth Centuries, and also the adoption of certain improvements from the middle of the latter century. The general character of these changes and their effects have been indicated in several modern works in relation to the evidence of local ordinances or market customs, and the counsels of perfection set forth in contemporary

treatises or essays. These authorities, however, do not furnish us with concrete or appropriate data such as are available in plenty for the earlier period.

In his important and interesting monograph on the Hampshire manor of Crawley, Professor Gras of Harvard has attempted to describe the economic and social condition of the English 'peasant yeoman farmer' in the post-mediæval period from documentary evidence, and such an intimate description has been found possible to a certain extent in this and other cases, thanks to the local patriotism or family piety that has discovered and published court rolls, testamentary inventories, parish registers and household accounts or memoranda. Professor Gras has, indeed, failed to find a single farm account compiled by the yeoman tenantry of Crawley after the Fifteenth Century; but his exhaustive researches only confirm the dictum of earlier investigators of the existing agrarian records. It may be admitted that this yeomanry came from a conservative stock, for Arthur Young found Midland farmers still yoking a third horse to the plough in the style of the ancient *δεξιό-στροφος*, the now supernumerary beast being escorted by an unrecognised representative of the long-forgotten bearer of the ox-goad. Professor Gras has found, too, among these later Hampshire customary tenants an attachment to such derelict landmarks as balks and fences, and instances of this rustic trait could be multiplied.

At the same time, we may have reason to suppose that the yeoman farmer or husbandman of the Sixteenth Century was more capable of making the demesne lands pay than his mediæval predecessor, because if the lord's bailiff and his farm hands could not make a profit with the help of the village reeve and the customaries, one or the other could take advantage of the favourable terms of a land-and-stock lease. It seems reasonable, too, to suppose that, apart from local advantages, the Sixteenth Century yeoman must have gained some further enlightenment from the spirit of the age. He still remained under the shadow of the custom of the manor, with its new anti-tillage complex; but he could now read for himself the Gospel of work which declares that the sluggard will not plough by reason of the cold, and therefore shall he beg in harvest and have nothing; that 'he who soweth

sparingly shall reap sparingly'; while the Lord of the harvest will see to it that husbandmen 'must first labour before they partake of the fruits.'

On the whole, one is inclined to believe that from the Fourteenth to the Sixteenth Century the lord's steward or bailiff, or a keeper or receiver for the Crown, would have been more likely than any other to take a lease of demesne lands, and even to buy the freehold when an opportunity occurred. This happened in a case which has been previously mentioned, as it had happened three hundred years before in the case of a former steward of a Northampton monastery. However, the estate book of Henry of Bray, the Thirteenth Century lordling, with its genealogical ostentations and complacent landlordisms differs widely from the farm journal of the Jacobean yeoman referred to, which we will now explore.*

There are several omissions in the description of this Berkshire farm in respect of its economic and social environment. We learn that the old manor house and a secondary house had been let at substantial rents; but we have no description of the later Tudor owners' habitation, nor any note on the important subject of the upkeep of buildings which absorbed such a large part of the profits of mediæval agriculture. Henry of Bray, seven generations earlier, can tell us more about 'old work' and 'new work' of masons and other artisans than of 'day works' on his demesne; while Henry Best, one generation later, dilates on the capacity of his great barn, without enlightening us as to his success in filling it. Other members of a select band of literate landowners before the Commonwealth may enable us to count their broad acres; to reconstruct the interiors of their mansions and to check their daily dress and diet; to be bored with their interminable lawsuits, or moved with their joys or sorrows. But few tell us, not how to farm the land, but how they farm it themselves, crop after crop and year after year.

This sketchiness is quite intelligible; but we find another type of the manor lord, often of ancient lineage,

* This document has been preserved among the manorial muniments of the Loder-Symonds family, and permission was kindly given to the writer to make use of it, while deposited in the British Museum, by Captain Loder-Symonds, R.N.

who from early habit or limited capacity was better versed in estate management or sport than in social amenities or politics; though the ceremonious customs of the age did not allow him to forget his birthright. Although his family had possessed the manor for three generations, young Robert Loder was to all intents a yeoman farmer, without the refinement, learning, or knowledge of affairs displayed in the journals of his elder and younger contemporaries, Adam Winthrop of Groton, and Ralph Josselin, Rector of Earl's Colne. The rustic simplicity of a later Tudor yeoman's menage was in sympathy with manorial traditions. The monks or clerks or household officers who were the earlier keepers or caretakers of manorial estates kept up no lordly state. It was left for lawyers or merchants to carry on the family achievements displayed in the great hall or recorded in a chest of archives.

The Berkshire manor which was the scene of the successful husbandry described in this account book was not identified by the Historical Manuscript Commission's inspector, but it can easily be identified, from internal evidence, with the Black Prince's manor in Harwell, a parcel of the honour of St Valery. This was commonly known as the 'lower manor,' the 'upper manor' forming part of the Berkshire estates of the see of Winchester, for which bailliff's accounts exist from 1208 to 1450. Moreover, a few such accounts are preserved for the lower manor itself from 1278; and from both sources we can infer that much the same methods of cultivation had been pursued by our yeoman's predecessors since that early date.

The Black Prince had granted his manor to the collegiate church of Wallingford, and the tenant of the site seems to have bought the freehold, which thus passed into the possession of a yeoman family. We can even find precedents early in the reign of Edward I for some Seventeenth Century farming operations on this Harwell manor, and we also find some contracts. The dovecote brought in 5s. 0d. only, and the orchard no more; but there were many casks of cider in store. The grain crops were much the same in nature and extent, with an enormous difference in the yield and price; while customary and task labour, largely paid in food, was rigorously exacted. We find the marsh-land let out on grazing rents for horses,

just as it was let in 1611. The flock of a hundred sheep was half wiped out, as in 1611, by murrain. The cart-horses were there in 1278, but the ploughs were drawn by sixteen oxen. The poultry yard was replenished by rent hens, the cattle sheds by 'best beasts,' as heriots, and the grange by toll-corn from the mill. The customary rents and tallage and fines of court helped to swell the receipts for the year, amounting to 33*l.* 10*s.* 4½*d.* The expenses were only 13*l.* 0*s.* 5*d.*, but nothing was spent on the buildings or other upkeep, as the honour was then in the King's hands. Still, the profit was satisfactory according to a Thirteenth Century standard; though before long it would be swallowed up by subsistence farming, which was inevitable when half the village ate at the lord's table during several weeks of the year, and when the farm servants and the lord's own household absorbed a large part of the grain and other marketable produce.

We gather, from such references as occur in the Loder household accounts under James I, that the Harwell manor was no longer self-supporting. Although grain, malt, mutton, bacon, poultry, and even fruit were probably supplied from the farm, it had ceased to be a matter of policy to buy nothing that the land could produce. We find considerable sums spent not only on soap and candles, salt, starch, dried fish and fruit, sugar, rice, and spices, but also on beef, cheese, butter, milk, hops, and even on oatmeal and firewood. This expenditure suggests a higher standard of comfort, and also, perhaps, that the new type of 'hustling' farmer found it cheaper to spend over 11*l.* on cheese, butter, and milk than to 'set up' a dairy and distract the attention of a young wife and two invaluable maids from more important services in harvest-field, hay-field, orchard, hemp or flax patches, as well as in barn or market-place. The 'account book' itself is actually a gathering of paper sheets, small folio size, of which our farmer's writing, in a rather cramped but not illiterate hand, covers seventy-eight pages with notes, calculations, and statistics which are not in the conventional form of mediæval or post-mediæval accounts, but resemble the rough journals or ledger books of merchants and officials, of which specimens are preserved as far back as the Twelfth Century.

While Robert Loder was still little more than a boy

he showed both strength of will and good judgment in preparing himself to play the part of a man. He tells us that, in 1605, it occurred to him to plant a piece of ground called 'Fardings' with fruit trees; and he at once proceeded to carry out the idea after taking a lease for 26s. 8d. yearly at his own risk. A number of young trees failed and had to be renewed, while the profits for some years to come were very modest, after deducting tithe and cost of planting, picking, and marketing. Again, some years must be less profitable than others, and here we learn that the 'profitablest years' (as all fruit-growers know) were the most infrequent, 'for the Lord blesseth as it pleaseth Him.' Still these self-won profits from a little corner of the estate that was to come to him in due course must have been highly prized by Robert Loder, and the record of them forms a fitting prelude to a journal of the activities of his manhood in the field of husbandry. But even the excitements of a new plough, 'being the first that ever I had,' and the privilege of holding it himself for the tillage of the Westfield on the day he came of age, could not make this eager worker and shrewd observer forget the requirements of other portions of his heritage.

In course of time the Fardings venture was flanked by three more orchards, encompassed by mounds as a more sure defence than quick-set hedges and prepared at a smaller cost. So with the precision and foresight of a modern fruit-grower this self-taught bumpkin could account for crops of named apples, pears, damsons, and cherries, graded and marketed with skill and enterprise that were rewarded by a handsome profit on ever-growing sales. Thus the crop of cherries (mostly 'Swetings') had realised only 9s. 6d., which, after paying all expenses in 1610, figures in the account of 1618 at 6402 lbs. weight. We could scarcely expect such an achievement to be repeated every year, any more than it could be repeated now, as a matter of course; for with a heavy crop there was the same danger of a glut as now, and the margin of price could vary from 16s. 3d. to 8s. 6d., by the bushel, or from 5d. down to 1d. by the pound. In the case of apples, though a glut might be avoided by holding back the pippins for sale in May, June, and July, the divergence of price was still more marked, for while your pippin or russet or costard might fetch as much as 3s. 9d. per

bushel, the 'common' apples would sell for no more than 4*d.* These rates, which in modern currency might seem generous to the Berkshire farmer of to-day, were subject to the deduction of the cost of gathering, carriage, and tithe, which Robert Loder allowed for with as good grace as possible. But even so a ready market at these or any other prices was not to be found without some special effort, which could not easily be made by busy husbandmen. Here, however, as in so many other old-time farming operations, the farmer's wife or maid could come to his aid; and even Robert Loder did not grudge the cost of a maid going into Abingdon as a saleswoman with the cherry waggon for twenty-one days, at 6*d.* per day, when he read the result of the enterprise in these 'nottes,' with due gratitude for a 'marvellous encrease.'

These farm accounts tell the same story with regard to other special sources of profit. Among them we find the dovecote, a feudal perquisite which had outlasted the manorial mill and had increased in value through the enterprise of monopolists in saltpetre. Young pigeons commanded a ready sale, and with seven dozen to the brood a revenue of at least 5*l.* was assured from this source, after making allowance for carriage and tithe. Other receipts are noted from grazing 'leeses,' and here again Robert Loder had begun to exploit a favourite investment with small owners before he became his own front-rank man. We are told what profits he made in 1611 from 'The Hame,' which he had of his uncle Drew 'at a bargain.' This was evidently one of the marsh or 'fattening' lands suitable for summer pasturage of cattle, and our young farmer seems to have noted that uncles Drew, Ford, and Loder had not fully utilised its resources by granting leases for only ninety-three kine and bullocks at 1*s.* 6*d.* per head, with nine calves at half-price. Having taken over the several grazing rights, young Robert put in horses at increased leases of 2*s.* 6*d.* per head, besides raising the price of leases on another marsh from 13*d.* to 15*d.*

In later years we find him equally concerned to make the most of any permanent or occasional grass-land that might be used for pasture or hay in various parts of his estate—the grass under fruit trees and the 'latter-math' of the mead and paddock, which could be grazed by many beasts on shilling leases. As for the main hay

crop, this was next to the arable crops in value and importance, and figured accordingly in memoranda of the number of hay-cocks that could be counted to a load, and of loads to a rick. Perhaps this satisfying count was due to a mild adventure with a new device for irrigating the mead in order to increase its fertility. For this and for the 'wanting' of the mead our energetic young farmer was content to pay contract prices, and also for 'thistling,' which, like mole-catching, was usually a communal operation.

Though we find these references to the grazing of cattle, there is little about sheep and practically nothing about pigs or fowls, which are of such importance to the modern farmer. The reason will appear from a glance at the map, for marsh-lands were not suitable for sheep grazing; and though Robert Loder 'set up a fold,' even two, he was somewhat dismayed by the cost of shepherd's wages, hurdles, and medicines, and still more by the inevitable result of the marsh-land infection. He relates that 1613 was a year of floods followed next year by a great mortality from murrain, a statement which is confirmed by the drafting of 'rotten' sheep from the folds. As for pigs, wood-land was not available and grass-land was too valuable to be up-rooted, for here, in 1278, the swineherd lost his holding for leaving the pigs unringed. Since, too, there was no dairy, there would be no large stock of poultry, and we may suspect that at this date the breeding of live stock was discouraged by the rigorous exaction of tithes and by an unfair purveyance. On the other hand, with cereal crops the tithes could be reckoned on the spot by the 'stook,' and not the best sheaves picked. Again, the liability for purveyance of grain and forage was shared by the country-side.

Towards the close of his first year's farming, Robert Loder was minded to take stock of his position during a period which is dignified in rustic Latin as 'in anno supra.' He first sets down his capital as 'what I was worth,' and the statement was certainly not encouraging. He had in hand 53*l*. His prospective father-in-law and an uncle owed him more than 200*l*., but he owed nearly as much himself. As assets there was only the value of his plough with its gear and horses, against which must be set 'depreciation of stock,' 'interest on loan,' and

'loss of stock unemployed.' Allowance had to be made for this bad start in calculating future prospects, and Loder allowed himself the luxury of a more sanguine forecast of probable profits in the coming year, when his sheep-flock would become available; and in March 1612, we have a muster of over three hundred sheep worth 120*l.* and a pile of wool tods valued at nearly a third of that sum.

The contemplation of these figures seems to have led to a review of the possibility of making grass once more the paramount interest of farming, with sheep and wool, cattle and hay taking the place of cereal crops, whereby the labour bill might be cut out and the great tithe and purveyance passed on to the arable farmer. The proposition was undoubtedly an attractive one on paper, for grazing involved only small expense, relatively, and the cost of 'setting up the folds' was amply repaid by the preparation of the barley lands, while the cost of getting in the hay crop, worth 43*l.*, was trifling. Therefore, by 'putting down' the plough-team and leasing the arable land for half the sum that represented the average profits of tillage, the difference might be easily made good by saving the wages of carters and the feed and caparison of horses. The risk of unfavourable weather might also be avoided, though this was perhaps a smaller risk than would be incurred by a stock-master.

The plough used by Robert Loder is elaborately described, but we have no particulars of the team, except that horses and not oxen are mentioned in connection with the cost of the stable. The writer does not even tell us how much land he could plough in a day, or how a tilth was obtained previous to sowing. As the crop for 1611 was sown 'to-halves,' the seed was supplied from various quarters and could not be reckoned, but exact details of the yield are given for the succeeding years to 1620. The harvest of 1611, as might have been expected, was only moderately good, and only about a third of its market value was realised by sales of grain, the rest being consumed by the household and the stables. This disposition savours of the old subsistence farming, and Robert Loder was clearly dissatisfied; for after balancing this year's account he fell to calculating once more whether it would not pay him better to let the plough-land.

Certainly the subsistence charges ran away with a great deal of the grain, but the market prices that it fetched were such as would fill our own 'husbandmen' with envy—wheat at 30s. 0d. (worth at least 90s. of our money) and pulse in proportion. On the other hand, the rate of the yield was much smaller than in these days, while the loss from primitive harvesting, gleanings, and vermin, etc., was greater, both in respect of grain and of straw and chaff. After reckoning the forage and grain consumed by his horses, their owner has to debit his account with their keep and harness. Against this he credits the stable with earnings, for carriage of crops, litter, and wood, besides cash received from carting jobs and sixty loads of manure. But horses are useless without horsemen and horse-keepers, whose wages amounted to 17l. 12s. 0d. This old problem of labour was another cause of worry to our yeoman. The cost of tillage also included both the wages and part subsistence of the village harvesters and the subsequent work of threshing and winnowing the grain. As some 110 'lands' were cropped, costing under 10l. to harvest, producing 73 quarters of grain, costing 73s. to thresh and winnow, this burden would seem to a modern farmer a very light one, although it did not cover the further cost of thatching and marketing, or the hayward's communal fee.

With his 'nottes' on the harvest of 1612 this Berkshire yeoman gets into his stride as a convinced adherent of tillage in preference to grazing, and from this time he discards the old fetish of subsistence farming. It is no longer a question of the respective merits of live and dead stock, but of the relative values of wheat and barley or of barley and malt. Year after year he is able to record a satisfactory or even a 'prodigious' yield of grain, and we have the strange experience of reading the confession of an English farmer that the prosperity of his affairs exceeds his most sanguine expectations. The statistics afforded by these farm accounts are certainly remarkable. For the nine years, from 1612 to 1620, the mean totals of Robert Loder's receipts and expenses amounted to 376l. and 136l. respectively, the highest and lowest figures being 453l. and 160l. in 1619, with 319l. and 120l. in 1613 and 1612 respectively.

Our farmer's commentary on details of the several

crops is still more interesting. The rotation and yield of the grain crops are given for the year, and in some cases the yield of the individual yard-lands is indicated. When garnered, the yield could be estimated again by the cubic space occupied in the grange or by the dimensions of the stacks standing in the courtyards. These methods are still used, though not consistently, for the modern farmer need not be prepared to check a sudden demand for tithe, subsidy, or purveyance. Equally interesting is Robert Loder's calculation of the relative yields of white and red wheat; but more valuable still, perhaps, is his private record of the fluctuation of grain prices on market days. These painstaking statistics may throw light on the official summaries recorded in connection with the Assize of Bread as well as on the trade price-lists compiled and issued, somewhat later, by corn-factors for the guidance of their customers and correspondents. All these details are emphasised by ingenuous reflections on the 'truly marvellous yield' of the bushel from only seven sheaves, 'and not great ones neither.' Even from nine sheaves this yield was satisfactory, for we read that 'the Lord maketh the clouds to drip fatness.'

This interesting and unique account will supply further evidence of the fact that the possibilities of obtaining largely increased profits from agriculture by means of more scientific methods of tillage had attracted the attention of a younger generation of yeomen farmers in the early years of the Seventeenth Century. It may perhaps also emphasise the fact that such industrial developments are only possible in favourable circumstances, such as arose in the latter half of the Sixteenth Century, when the wasteful and costly methods of mediæval farming had become a mere tradition, following the political and economic upheaval in the preceding generation. At the same time, there are other factors to be considered, and these play an important part in all generalisations of our early agrarian history. There is the desperate struggle to enforce or resist enclosures which may seem to have had as their objective the redistribution of the manor lands by squeezing out the old customary tenants for the benefit of the landlord and his newly rack-rented tenants, whose skilful methods would make them more desirable partners in agrarian

industry. Then there is the use of field-grass husbandry, with catch crops and irrigation, to supplement the course of tillage in the above connection. Again, we have to note the growing tendency towards a tripartite occupation of the manor farms by landlord, tenant farmer, and day-labourers, to the exclusion of the free smallholder; and, finally, the significance of quit-rents as commutations of service, and the jealousy of surviving manorial perquisites—mill, dovecote, warren, fishery, and unfair share of meadow, pasture, and wood. All these may have contributed to the making of the yeoman or tenant farmer, or to his undoing. But besides these and other factors, or in spite of them, it may be suggested that, as in other industries or in commerce, advancement was due partly to opportunity, but chiefly to individual character, which gradually influenced the whole system of English agriculture.

The above conclusion is suggested by the receipt side of the Harwell yeoman's account; but the expenditure of this successful 'husbandman' might point a general moral. The expenses were low, not merely because Robert Loder had no rent to pay, but because he had not to contend with the crushing burden of rates and taxes that is imposed on the modern tenant farmer and smallholder. Robert Loder's cess for poor relief and public works was negligible, though at his death he endowed a local charity, like others of his house and class. His contributions to the revenues of Church and State were also small in relation to his industrial gains; and above all he escaped the ravages of foreign or civil war which with feudal exactions and a corrupt administration were a common cause of ruin to mediæval farmers, who had not yet the organised protection of Courts of Equity and Quarter Sessions, backed by a watchful Council and Parliament.

There is left a special moral for historians and publicists who are now increasingly responsible for the integrity and sobriety of an economic and social policy based on national or international ideals. The discovery from time to time of documents that may help to fill obvious gaps in the materials that are available for a correct interpretation of the history of past times, without which we cannot appreciate the true significance of later events. For what we must seek in all our public or private discussions on

questions of national importance is the truth, which can be demonstrated or inferred from contemporary and impartial records. The discovery of truth is the avowed object and also the ostensible motive of the existence of a number of learned societies engaged in historical, archaeological, and linguistic research. To facilitate such researches, lists and indexes or calendars of records are prepared by archivists or guides to the printed sources by librarians, while Royal Commissions and departmental or academic committees prepare reports on the state of public or private archives. Unfortunately, we are apt to ignore or neglect this good work through a persistent habit of taking the facts for granted.

This is no trifling matter. The recent researches of Sir William Beveridge and the late Sir William Ashley on the bread that was the staff of mediæval life, and of Dr H. W. Saunders on the manorial and household economics of the Norwich Benedictines, have shown how many important sources have been missed or only partly utilised. In some cases, indeed, the sources may have been actually mentioned in bibliographical descriptions. For example, a summary description of our Berkshire yeoman's farm account is given in the Thirteenth Report of the Historical Manuscripts Commission. 'Josselin's Diary' was discovered in private custody by a local antiquary and was published by the Royal Historical Society, with the Cely and Stonor 'Papers' and the 'Cottenham Common Rights,' discovered by Archdeacon Cunningham in a parish chest. Adam 'Winthrop's Diary,' written in Suffolk, accompanied its author's son in his pilgrimage to New England, whence it was presented by the generosity of a later owner to the British Museum. Here it would probably have remained unnoticed if it had not been selected for publication by the Massachusetts Historical Society, and the same remark might apply to Dr Eleanor Lodge's Kentish farm accounts, edited for the British Academy. Professor Thorold Rogers would not make use of the Naworth estate accounts apparently because he distrusted the florid style of the Surtees editor; but the references to subsistence farming and eleemosynary house-keeping in the unpublished accounts of Archbishop Laud are of undoubted value. Another unpublished estate

book relates to the manor of Peckham, owned by the family of Twysden; others are known to exist, though these are not all available; and though none is comparable to the Loder-Symonds MS., they might at least receive consideration in view of the fact that no regular series of farm accounts is available in continuation of the invaluable series of bailiffs' accounts previous to the Dissolution of the Monasteries, a fact which does not seem to have been duly appreciated in the haste and confusion of modern historical research. For the provenance and even the *raison d'être* of scattered documents are increasingly confused; a tragic loss of material sources for a period when the very elements present unthought-of problems, while the human factor is even more elusive:

'What, without asking, hither hurried, whence?

And, without asking, whither hurried hence?'

There is now a great opportunity of making good, to some extent at least, this unfortunate void by producing materials which economic historians are waiting to utilise for the benefit of an increasing body of students. Since the memorable Reports of the departmental Local Records Committee in 1902 and the Royal Commission on Public Records in 1919, which were usefully discussed by delegates of the Congress of Archæological Societies in 1921, local culture has been responsible for a widespread protest against ignorant and reckless destruction of local records, coupled with a desire to make better provision for their safe custody and arrangement. This movement has recently been organised by the British Record Society under the auspices of the Master of the Rolls and an influential Committee of official archivists, librarians and local antiquaries with a view to locating and describing the flotsam and jetsam of county, municipal, parochial, manorial, and family muniments or memoranda which have hitherto escaped the nets of official or individual researchers.

It is believed that an appeal for facilities and for funds to enable the organisers to deal with these forgotten or neglected materials for historical or archæological study will meet with a favourable response, and all who appreciate the importance of the occasion will wish that this expectation may be realised.

Art. 9.—ST KILDA, PAST AND PRESENT.

ST KILDA is the name popularly applied to what most folks imagine to be a single, isolated outpost lying somewhere to the west of the chain of islands known as the Outer Hebrides. To be more accurate, however, it is the name of a group of islands situated some forty miles to the west of Harris and North Uist, the largest of which is called Hirta. This group, which anciently was referred to as Hirta, lies about as far to the west of the main chain comprising the Outer Isles as the lonely Isles of North Rona and Sula Sgeir lie to the north-north-east of the Butt of Lewis. Than the two Islands just mentioned there can be no lonelier places off the coast of Scotland except, perhaps, St Kilda, or the unpeopled cliffs of Rockall, far out on the Atlantic Shelf. North Rona was once populated by a commonwealth similar to that which has recently evacuated St Kilda. Geological characteristics show that all these Islands—the St Kilda group, Rockall, North Rona and Sula Sgeir, Haskeir, Heiskeir or the Monach Isles, and the Seven Hunters or Flannan Isles—are but the remnants of a land that æons ago was either submerged or eroded away. There can be no doubt that North Rona, for instance, once formed part of the great Outer Hebrides ridge, stretching from Barra Head to the Butt of Lewis, and then some forty miles in a north-north-easterly direction, a total distance of more than a hundred and seventy miles. All the Islands aforementioned are quite possibly vestiges of Atlantis, the Lost Continent.

The main islands of the St Kilda group are, in order of size, Hirta, Soay, Boreray, and Dùn, their areas, respectively, being 1575, 244, 190, and 80 acres. In addition, the group comprises a number of isolated stacks, some of which attain considerable altitude. Three such stacks lie in the channel between Hirta and the Isle of Soay—Stac Soay, Stac Biorach, and Stac Dona. Off the entrance to the Bay of Hirta (Village Bay) lies the stack known as Levenish. The two most famous stacks of the group, however, are situated off the Island of Boreray. They are called Stac an Armin (627 ft.) and Stac Lee (544 ft.). Added to these is a great number of lesser stacks and reefs, most of which fringe the western seaboard of Hirta itself. Hirta has been the only inhabited member of the group,

so far as we know. Its greatest length and breadth are $2\frac{1}{2}$ miles and $1\frac{1}{2}$ miles.

Boreray lies to the north-east of Hirta, a distance of about four miles. John Mathieson, who probably knows the topography of these islands better than any one living or dead, says that, with the exception of Soay, the landing on Boreray is the worst of the group. It is possible to leap on to the rocks of Boreray only when the boat rises on the wave. Each person after landing has to scramble up some three hundred feet of cliff with a rope round his waist for safety. On Boreray there are several stone and turf hutments ('cleits') in which the St Kildans used to live for about a week at the time when taking the fleeces from the hundreds of sheep pastured there. The grassy slopes of Boreray are riddled with the burrows of puffins.

The cliffs forming the coast-line of all the Islands are honeycombed with caves and caverns and fissures. Some of the caves extend subterraneously for a distance exceeding two hundred feet. When overtaken by storms while away on fowling or sheep-shearing expeditions at Boreray, the St Kildans often spent the night in one or other of its many caves or *geos*. A glance at the Ordnance Survey map prepared a year or two ago by John Mathieson and my friend, A. M. Cockburn, shows that the St Kildans have a name for every *geo* in the intricate coast-line of Hirta and its adjacent islands and stacks. And there is not a *gob* or promontory wanting a name. There are literally hundreds of *gobs* and *geos* among the place-names of the St Kilda group.

St Kilda does not appear in the Calendar of Saints. I incline to the belief that the name is of Culdee origin. But in his 'Celtic Place-names of Scotland,' Professor Watson suggests that the name is derived from the Norse, *kilde*, a well. Hirta means gloom or death. Besides the *geos*, there are several other place-names in St Kilda that obviously are of Scandinavian origin. A skerry lying a little to the south of Soay Island is still referred to by the natives as *Sgeir Mhic Rìgh Lochlainn*, Rock of the Son of the King of Norway. Very little of this skerry is showing at high-water; but the natives told me that it received its name centuries ago when a vessel belonging to the son of the King of Norway grounded upon it.

Records mentioning the ownership of St Kilda are puzzling and contradictory. There is little doubt, however, that for a very long time it has been the property of MacLeod of MacLeod. There is a tradition current in the Western Highlands that long ago a dispute arose between MacLeod of Dunvegan and MacDonald of Clan Ranald as to the ownership of St Kilda. Eventually it was decided that two galleys should make for the Island, one rowed by MacLeods and the other by MacDonalds ; and that the clansman whose hand first touched St Kilda should be regarded as having won it for his Chief. The race was a close one. And, when there seemed a danger at the last moment that the MacDonalds were going to win, one of the MacLeods chopped off his hand and cast it ashore, thus having touched St. Kilda first. In any case, the connection between Dunvegan and St Kilda is centuries old. Mr John MacKenzie, who is factor to MacLeod of MacLeod at Dunvegan, is of opinion that the St Kilda group of islands has been in the possession of the MacLeod Chiefs for years immemorial, and that it formed part of the extensive territories transferred from Norway to the Scottish Crown about 1265. As a matter of fact, I believe there is extant no documentary evidence on the subject of ownership ; but, as I have said, Hirta has a long-standing association with Dunvegan. The only period during which it may have passed out of the control of the MacLeods was during the ascendancy of the Lords of the Isles, who received direct charters from the Crown empowering them, for a time at any rate, to regard the MacLeods as their vassals.

The whole of the St Kilda group is dominated by the towering peak of Conachair, the highest mountain, which attains an altitude of 1396 feet. On the seaward side of this mountain the cliffs sheer perpendicularly to the Atlantic, more than 1200 feet below. The sea-cliffs of Conachair are regarded as comprising the deepest perpendicular precipice in the British Isles. At least two other peaks on Hirta are worthy of note ; to wit, the Mullach Mòr and Oiseval, which are 1164 and 948 feet respectively. At that part of the Island of Hirta known as the Cambir one may review cliffs rising out of the sea to over 1100 feet, populated by myriads of birds. A tremendous rock jutting seaward at a height of some

hundreds of feet is called the Lover's Stone, since it is said that in olden times a prospective bridegroom seeking the heart and hand of a St Kildan bride was required to demonstrate his prowess by standing on the very edge of it on one leg, as if he were on the point of leaping over into the Atlantic surge.

Hirta possesses no rivers ; but several streams and streamlets drain the higher ground. Among the many wells and springs on St Kilda, all of which deserve to be noted for their excellent water, is *Tobar nam Buaidh*, the Well of Virtues. The water of this well was considered efficacious against all manner of ailments. Hard by it stood the shrine on which the St Kildans placed votive offerings. *Tobar Childa* is believed by some to be the well from which this group of islands received its name. When in olden times the St Kildans were delayed by contrary winds, they used to resort to *Tobar na Cille*, the Well of St Brendan. It is said that the direction of the wind altered in their favour when each man about to put out to sea stood astride the waters of this well for a few seconds. The weather of St Kilda is characterised by heavy rains, damp mists, and not infrequent gales. Tempestuous winds and heavy seas have been the portion of the community for the greater part of the year. The Islands are also subject to keen frost and severe snowstorms.

There is on St Kilda neither tree nor shrub. The common nettle is found only within the walls of the ancient burying-place behind the village. Ferns grow in a few sheltered clefts ; and honeysuckle flowers luxuriantly even on the exposed cliffs of Oiseval. It is thought that the latter plant has been introduced by birds. Hirta can boast two fairly large patches of daisies, although it appears that in 1897 no daisies were to be found on the Island. Iris plants thrive in the marshy places ; and the creeping thistle is now to be found in the vicinity of the factor's house. The grasses of St Kilda are abundant and nutritious as pasturage. It has been estimated that the Island possesses no fewer than 130 species of grasses, sedges, and rushes.

Naturalists are agreed that the fauna of St Kilda has an interest of its own. Its bird-life, on which a great deal has been written, is remarkable. According to Mr Seton Gordon, the eminent Scottish ornithologist, the

solan goose does not nest on Hirta itself, but on the cliffs of Boreray, and at a height of more than a thousand feet above the Atlantic. They also breed on the smaller islets, and on the two great stacks adjoining Boreray. The fulmar petrel and the puffin are the two birds most in evidence on the St Kilda group. Myriads of fulmars inhabit the precipices where the cliffs of Conachair sweep sheer to the sea from an altitude of 1300 feet. Seldom have the puffins and fulmars been seen to cross over that part of St Kilda where the village lies. The sea-cliffs are also the habitat of guillemots, kittiwakes, and razor-bills. And ornithologists believe Hirta to have been the last nesting-place of the great auk. Puffins are found in greatest numbers on Boreray and Soay, where they burrow into the grassy and peaty slopes above the cliffs. Since St Kilda is devoid of anything in the nature of a rabbit, the puffin may be regarded as its only burrowing animal. Gulls of all kinds, oyster-catchers, ducks, and scarts also frequent Hirta in great numbers. Land-birds are few. Seton Gordon has noted migrating swifts on the Island; and I have seen numbers of sparrows. Or were the latter wrens? I am not quite sure now. The bird-life of St Kilda is similar to that haunting the gigantic cliffs of Mingulay and Berneray (Barra Head), both of which islands have now been unpeopled for some considerable time.

In the days before the St Kildans became so dependent upon supplies imported either by the S.S. 'Hebrides' or by her sister-ship, the 'Dunara Castle,' the fulmar and the gannet formed two of the main articles of diet on the Island. And not only did they use these birds for food, but they also extracted from them the oil burned in their cruises. In addition, the feathers were used for pillows and mattresses. Referring to the indispensability of the fulmar, the Rev. Kenneth MacAulay, minister of Ardmannurchan, elicited the following statement from an intelligent native as long ago as 1758: 'Can the world exhibit a more valuable commodity? The fulmar furnishes oil for the lamp, down for the bed, the most salubrious food, and the most efficacious ointment for healing wounds, besides a thousand other virtues of which he is possessed which I have not time to enumerate. But to say all in one word, deprive us of the fulmar, and St Kilda is no

more.' MacAulay mentions, too, that great quantities of fulmars were salted in casks each year to provide winter provision.

Hardly less important was the gannet, or solan goose. Martin Martin (1697) refers to him in the following passage: 'The solangeese are very numerous here, insomuch that the inhabitants commonly keep yearly above twenty thousand young and old in their little stone houses, of which there are some hundreds for preserving their fowls, eggs, etc. They use no salt for preserving their fowls, the eggs of the sea wild-fowl are preserved some months in the ashes of peats, and are astringent to such as be not accustomed to eat them.' In Martin's time the population of St Kilda was 180 souls. So the Islanders must have been particularly fond of gannets toward the close of the seventeenth century.

Authorities on bird-life have all noted the very marked increase in the number of fulmars on St Kilda since the natives have ceased to use such great quantities of them for food. The change in the dietary of the Islanders commenced about 1877, the year in which the 'Dunara Castle' began her regular calls at St Kilda during the summer months. This increase has been noted by Mr MacKenzie, MacLeod's factor, who has paid an annual visit to St Kilda for many a year now. Long ago the St Kildans existed entirely on what their own islands and the sea supplied them with—birds and their eggs, mutton from the famous St Kilda sheep, a little beef, milk, butter, cheese, crowdie, oat-meal and barley-meal, and fish. The meal was ground by the ancient querns. The pursuit of sea-fowl on the cliffs, as also the frequency with which the sheep have evaded capture on the inaccessible rocks, have made the St Kildans a wonderful race of cragsmen.

Frogs, lizards, toads, and snakes are unknown on St Kilda. Neither are there rats, rabbits, nor hares on the Island. Groom's 'Ordnance Gazetteer of Scotland' (1885) refers to the mouse as its only wild animal. In a few years' time Hirta may be able to boast a number of wild cats, for, despite the fact that the other day a famous London newspaper assured the public that the cat was unknown on St Kilda, at the time of the evacuation every household owned at least a couple of the feline tribe. Except in a few cases, the inhabitants left their cats on Hirta to

fend for themselves. Circumstances will now compel these creatures to return to a wild state. They may now play havoc with St Kilda's long-tailed field-mouse, and its own particular house-mouse, the *mus muralis*. The latter is a unique variety of the domestic mouse. For generations he has confined himself to the post-office building. Some years ago Dr James Ritchie, with the assistance of the postmaster on St Kilda, endeavoured to transport a number of living specimens to Edinburgh; but every one of them pined away and died in transit. Time will tell what fate awaits the post-office mouse after St Kilda has been depopulated, and the natives' cats are obliged to forage for themselves. A London naturalist, writing to the 'Morning Post' some months ago, showed concern for the future of this species, since his present home is to be allowed to fall into desuetude and ruin. He considered the fate of the *mus muralis* as one of the minor tragedies of St Kilda, and asks—

' Oh, what will become of the Post-Office mouse,
When the Post-Office posts no more ?
It will mope, it will mope in the Post-Office house,
And die on the Post-Office floor.'

Naturalists have also expressed anxiety for the future of the St Kilda wren, a bird that has the distinction of having had a special Act of Parliament passed solely for its protection. The St Kilda wren is larger than its mainland cousin, and has a stronger and thicker bill. Its nest is ruder and, therefore, more in keeping with its wilder surroundings. Its eggs are a little larger.

Turning to domesticated mammals, we find that St Kilda had neither pigs nor goats, and that at the time of the inhabitants' forsaking it there was no horse. In Martin's time Hirta had eighteen horses. By 1841 that number had fallen to four. Tradition has it that the few remaining animals were taken off the Island by a former lessee, on the grounds that they were injuring the pasturage which he was desirous of reserving for sheep. The absence of the horse argues the absence of the plough. Until about 1835, tillage on St Kilda was done with the ancient *cas-chrom*, or 'bent-foot' plough, worked by hand and foot. The little delving in more recent times has been done with the ordinary spade. The dogs on St Kilda at

the time of the evacuation were of a mongrel type of collie. They were no good at rounding a flock of sheep, but were excellent at catching an individual sheep and holding it fast until its owner was able to get his hands on it. Sad to relate, the majority of the dogs was drowned by the natives in anticipation of their leaving the Island for their new homes on the mainland of Argyll. The midge is by no means unknown on St Kilda, as the writer can testify from his own experiences when wandering on its moors and hillsides with a camera. Neither was the common house-fly a stranger in the dwellings of the inhabitants at the time of their leaving.

St Kilda is famous for its sheep. With the Island of Soay is associated the Soay sheep. Soay, incidentally, means Sheep Isle. Dr Ritchie describes the Soay sheep as a domestic breed derived from the Mouflon sheep, so thoroughly domesticated and improved by breeding that the wool-coat has become a fleece quite obscuring the original coat of hair. He remarks upon its primitiveness, and describes it as 'a living picture of an early stage through which the herdsman bred, from wild sheep, the highly specialised breeds of the modern flock-master.' The sheep on Soay belong to MacLeod of MacLeod. An interesting feature of the breed is that the tail never reaches the hocks. These sheep are never clipped. The wool is simply plucked off when it becomes loose, because shearing would remove both the fleece and the under-coating of short hair, which is necessary to protect the animal against the severities of the St Kildan winter. The plucking of the wool in this fashion is known as 'rueing.' It is practised in the Shetlands, Iceland, and the Faroe Isles. It was long regarded in England as a survival of barbarism among the Islanders, and was actually classified along with such practices as 'ploughing by the tail.' At the end of the seventeenth century the sheep on the St Kilda group of Islands numbered about two thousand. Toward the close of the nineteenth century it was estimated that the number had fallen to twelve hundred, at which time it is believed the natives were averse to making an accurate return, as the proprietor fixed his rents in proportion to the size of each tenant's sheep-stock.

Brief though it be, the first really authentic informa-

tion we have of St Kilda is supplied by Donald Monro who, as High Dean of the Isles, travelled through most of the Hebrides in the year 1594. In his 'Description of the Western Isles of Scotland called Hybrides,' Monro reports that the inhabitants of Hirta, 'where the streams of the sea are starke,' are a simple, poor people, 'scarce learnt in aney religioun.' He also mentions that the steward of MacLeod of Harris came in midsummer of each year along with a chaplain to baptise any children. On one occasion on which MacLeod's steward took a quantity of malt to the Island to brew for his own consumption, the natives, finding that they liked the concoction, fell to consuming it until 'baith men, weemen, and bairns were deid drunken.' In Martin's time (approximately a hundred and fifty years later), when the steward went from Skye to demand payment of the rents, they were paid in wool, down, butter, cheese, cows, horses, fowls, oil, and barley. I think that Dean Monro's account is sufficiently interesting to warrant my reproducing it in full:

'To the West Northwest of this Ile foresaid, out in the mayne ocean seas, be threescore of myle of sea, layes ane ile callit Hirta, ane maine laiche ile, sa far as is manurit of it, abundant in corne and gressing, manelie for scheipe, for ther ar fairer and greiter scheip ther, and larger tailed, then ther is in aney uther ile about. The inhabitants thereof ar simple poor people, scarce learnt in aney religioun, Bot M'Cloyd of Herray, his steward, or he quhom he deputs in sic office, sailes anes in the Zeir ther at midsummer, with some Chaplaine, they baptize ther bairns ther, and if they want a Chaplaine, they baptize ther Bairns themselves. The said steward, as he himself tauld me, ussit to take ane maske of malt ther with a masking fatt, and makes his malt, and ere the fatt be ready, the comons of the toun, baith men, weemen, and bairns, puts ther hands in the fatt, and findis it sweet, and eets the greyns after the sweetness therof, quhilk they leave nather wirt or draffe unsuppit out ther, quharwith baith men, weemen, and bairns were deid drunken, sua that they could not stand upon ther feet. The said Stewart receives thir dewties in meill and reistit mutton, wyld foullis reistit, and selchis. This Ile is maire nor ane myle lange, and narrest als meikle in braid, quhilk is not seine of aney shore, bot at the shoresyde of it lyes three grate hills, quhilk ar ane pairt of Hirta, quhilk ar sein affar off from the fore landis. In this

faire Ile is faire scheipe, falcon nests and wyld fowls biggand, but the streams of the sea ar starke, and ar verey eivil entring in aney of the saids iles. This ile of Hirta pertains of auld to M'Cloyd of Herryay."

Now comes the account of St Kilda contained in the description of the Western Isles supposed to have been written some time between 1577 and 1595. Here we read that no strangers went to Hirta 'oisting or weiris, becaus thay ar but a poor barbarous people unexpert that dwellis in it, useand na kynd of wappinis.' So far as my researches would justify my saying so, the next record we have is contained in George Buchanan's 'History of Scotland,' the *magnum opus* and the last great performance of this scholar who, with it, ended his life in 1582. Buchanan tells us that Hirta was fruitful in corn, cattle, and sheep. Its inhabitants he describes as having been ignorant of all the arts, and especially of religion. The first seventeenth-century record of St Kilda I have been able to trace is Monipennie's (*circa* 1612). His account is so similar to that of Buchanan's, however, that I am inclined to believe he took Buchanan as his authority. Monipennie mentions that in June 'the lord of this island sendeth his chamberlaine to gadder his dueties,' and concludes with a statement about the baptism of the children identical with that of Buchanan.

MacFarlane's 'Geographical Collections' (Vol. III) contains an instructive account of St Kilda, given to Sir Robert Sibbald about 1675 by the Lord Register, Sir George MacKenzie of Tarbat, from information supplied to the latter by intelligent persons dwelling on the Island at that time. MacKenzie's account reads as follows :

'The Island of Hirta, of all the Isles about Scotland lyeth farthest out into the sea, is very mountanous & not accessible but by climbing. It is incredible, what number of fowls frequent the rocks there ; so far as one can see, the sea is covered with them, and when they rise, they darken the sky, they are so numerous. They are ordinarily catched this way : A man lies upon his back with a long Pole in his hand, & knocketh them down, as they fly over him. There be many sorts of these fowls, some of them of strange shapes, among which there is one called the Gare-fowl, which is bigger than any Goose, and hath Eggs as big almost as those of the Ostrich. Amongst the other Commodities they export out of

the Island, this is none of the meanest, they take the fat of these fowls that frequent the Island and stuff the stomach of this fowl with it, which they preserve by hanging it near the Chimney, where it is dried with the smoke and they sell it to their neighbours on the Continent as a Remedy they use for aches and pains.

' Their sheep upon that Island of Hirta are far different from all others, having long leggs, long horns, and instead of wool, a blewish hair upon them, for the figure and description, it seems to approach in resemblance to the *Ovis Chilensis*, some natural Historians make mention of. Of the milk of these sheep, they make Butter, and a sort of cheese which my Lord Register saith, pleaseth his tast better then Hollands cheese. They have no salt there, but what they make by burning of seatangle which is very black. Their greatest trade is in feathers they sell and the exercise they affect most, is climbing of steep Rocks, he is the prettiest man who ventures upon the most inaccessible, though all they gain, is the Eggs of the Fowls, and the honour to dy, as many of their Ancestours, by breaking of their necks which Pliny observes of these people, which he calls Hyperborei.'

Martin's account is probably the most accurate. He tells us that the horses and cows on St Kilda in 1697 were smaller than those on the other islands he had visited, and that the sheep differed only in respect of their very long horns. The horses, eighteen in all, were employed only in carrying home peats and turf for fuel; but the natives rode them without bridle or saddle along the sands below the village at the annual cavalcade of All Saints.

I have mentioned already Martin's reference to the solan goose. His account contains a good deal of information on the sea-birds inhabiting the cliffs of Hirta. At the time of his visit the natives burned in their lamps the oil they obtained from the fulmar petrel when they secured that bird before he had had time to squirt it out, as he does on being approached. Martin tells us further that the fulmar oil was also used for removing rheumatic pains and aching in the joints, and that in Edinburgh and London it had proved itself an excellent antidote in cases of toothache and sprained ankles. Indeed, fulmar oil was regarded by the St Kildans as a panacea. He also mentions that the shores abounded with cod and ling, which the natives did not take the trouble to exploit to advantage.

The population of Hirta at this time was about 180. Martin informs us that the natives were well-proportioned. When a certain Islander went to Glasgow, he felt as though he had dropped out of the clouds. When he saw a pair of horses drawing a coach, which he took to be a tiny house with two men seated inside, he was of opinion that the horses were actually drawing the coach with their tails. This same native was greatly taken with the movement of the coach's wheels ; but he thought that only a coachman who was mad would sit on the roof of the little house, when he might be safer and more comfortable on the back of one of the horses. The further consternation of this St Kildan in Glasgow is best related in Martin's own inimitable words :

' When he went through the streets, he desired to have one to lead him by the hand. Thomas Ross, a merchant, and others, that took the diversion to carry him through the town, asked his opinion of the High Church. He answered that it was a large rock, yet there were some in St Kilda much higher, but that these were the best caves he ever saw ; for that was the idea which he conceived of the pillars and arches upon which the church stands. When they carried him into the church, he was yet more surprised, and held up his hands with admiration, wondering how it was possible for men to build such a prodigious fabric, which he supposed to be the largest in the universe. He could not imagine what the pews were designed for, and he fancied the people that wore masks (not knowing whether they were men or women) had been guilty of some ill thing, for which they dared not show their faces. He was amazed at women wearing patches, and fancied them to have been blisters. Pendants seemed to him the most ridiculous of all things ; he condemned periwigs mightily, and much more the powder used in them ; in fine, he condemned all things as superfluous he saw not in his own country. He looked with amazement on every thing that was new to him. When he heard the church bells ring he was under a mighty consternation, as if the fabric of the world had been in great disorder. He did not think there had been so many people in the world as in the city of Glasgow ; and it was a great mystery to him to think what they could all design by living so many in one place. He wondered how they could all be furnished with provision ; and when he saw big loaves, he could not tell whether they were bread, stone, or wood. He was amazed to think how they could be provided with ale,

for he never saw any there that drank water. He wondered how they made them fine clothes, and to see stockings made without being first cut, and afterwards sewn, was no small wonder to him. He thought it foolish in women to wear thin silks, as being a very improper habit for such as pretended to any sort of employment. When he saw the women's feet, he judged them to be of another shape than those of the men, because of the different shape of their shoes. He did not approve of the heels of shoes worn by men and women; and when he observed horses with shoes on their feet, and fastened with iron nails, he could not forbear laughing, and thought it the most ridiculous thing that ever fell under his observation. He longed to see his native country again, and passionately wished it were blessed with ale, brandy, tobacco, and iron, as Glasgow was.'

Is not Martin delightfully entertaining? He has certainly produced more interesting reading than have those twentieth-century journalists from Glasgow, who, not content with harassing the poor St Kildans in their homes a few days before they left, actually tracked them down at Oban and Lochaline, to ask them how and what they felt. The difference between Martin and the Glasgow journalists is that the former sought his information for its own interest.

Time was when the St Kildans resented the coming of strangers to their Island, largely because they believed that they brought with them what was termed the 'boat cold.' The natives declared that they were always infected with colds after the visit of a stranger to the Island. Sometimes they referred to this epidemic as 'the stranger's cough' (*cnatan nan gall*). As a rule, they blamed strangers from Glasgow for its introduction, though their Harris neighbours also were held responsible at various times. It is many a day now since the St Kildans said 'good-bye' to this belief which, doubtless, was based on accurate observation. The 'boat cold' is alluded to by James Boswell in his 'Life of Samuel Johnson.' Boswell mentions that in compiling his account of St Kilda the Rev. Kenneth MacAulay set out for the Island with a prejudice against prejudice, and strove to give the impression that he was a smart, up-to-date thinker. 'And yet he affirms for the truth,' writes Boswell, 'that when a ship arrives there all the inhabitants

are seized with a cold.' Dr Johnson was not at all sure that the natives caught cold in the manner alleged, although it had been proved to him that they annually complained of some malady when MacLeod's steward arrived. 'The steward always comes to demand something from them,' writes Johnson; 'and so they fall to coughing.' The most subtle explanation of the 'boat cold,' however, is not Johnson's, though frequently attributed to him. It is given by the Rev. Mr Christian, of Docking, and communicated to Boswell by his friend, Dr. Burney, who was favoured with this solution by a lady in Norfolk. 'The cause . . . is a natural one. The situation of St Kilda renders a north-east wind indispensably necessary before a stranger can land. The wind, not the stranger, occasions the epidemick cold.'

Hirta was the only inhabited Island of the St Kilda group. It is the largest and the most fertile. The village, crescent in form, consists of sixteen felt-roofed houses, a number of which were unoccupied at the time of the evacuation owing to the rapid decline in population during recent years. Zinc-roofed cottages were built by the proprietor between 1861 and 1862, following upon a tempest that had unroofed the earlier and more primitive dwellings, many of which were used as byres up till the night preceding the Islanders' leaving St Kilda. Martin gives the population as 180 in 1697. In 1724 the Island was sadly depopulated by an outbreak of smallpox, only four adults and twenty-six children surviving. Thereafter it appears to have been repopled from Harris, since in the year 1731 there occurs in the Minutes of the Directors of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge the following sentence: 'That regard might be had to the people of Hirta, which Island by the yearly transporting of people to it will soon be populous again.' When the Rev. Kenneth MacAulay went to St Kilda in 1758, the population was 88; and by 1815 it had risen again to 103. When the first government census of the Island was taken in 1851, it stood at 110; but by 1861 it had fallen to 78, owing chiefly to the fact that in 1856 thirty-six natives emigrated to Australia. Until just before the outbreak of the Great War, the population of St Kilda remained for years at approximately 74. At the time of the natives' forsaking the Island the population had dwindled to 36.

Two serious causes of premature death among the St Kildans were lockjaw and scurvy. But their worst problem in the last century was the death, about nine days after birth, of many children from infantile lockjaw. Every variety of reason has been given for this infant mortality. Many natives regarded it as Providence's way of limiting the population in circumstances where the means of subsistence were limited. 'If it's God's will that the babies should die, nothing you can do will save them,' was the dogmatic attitude adopted by an old native to the suggestion that the Islanders should have the services of a fully trained nurse.

It is of interest to note in passing that fifty years ago the inhabitants were grouped under the same five surnames as those to be found on the Island at the time of its evacuation—Ferguson, Gillies, MacDonald, MacKinnon, and MacQueen. That St Kilda was not always as poverty-stricken as the Press have sometimes suggested is shown by the following table, compiled in 1875, giving exports from the Island in that year, together with the prices received by the St. Kildans :

		£	s.	d.
Cloth	227 yards of 47 inches and thumb	25	10	0
Blankets	403 yards of 47 inches and thumb	27	0	0
Fulmar oil	566 gallons	45	6	0
Tallow	414 lbs.	6	12	0
Black feathers	1494 lbs.	26	5	0
Grey feathers	1179 lbs.	17	10	0
Cheese	646 lbs.	11	9	0
Fish	1080 marketable	31	10	0
One-year-old cattle	20 head	60	0	0

Comparatively speaking, Hirta is not rich in antiquities. Not a vestige is to be found to-day of the three churches referred to by Martin. At the foot of the Gleann Mòr, or Great Glen, stand the ruins of a building, beehive in style, alluded to as the Amazon's House. It was occupied by a warrior-woman who, says tradition, hunted between Harris and Hirta in the days before the sea separated them. Above the village is *Clach a' Bhainne*, the Milking-Stone. The abode occupied by the unfortunate Lady Grange is still to be seen. You will remember

that she was 'sequestered' on this Island by her husband for about eight years (1734-42), because he feared she might divulge certain Jacobite secrets. In latter years Lady Grange's dwelling has been used as a 'cleit' in which the natives stored hay and turf. Hume Brown, in his 'History of Scotland,' refers thus to the abduction of Lady Grange :

'James Erskine of Grange, brother of the Earl of Mar, and one of the Lords of Session . . . married to an uncomfortable wife, he had her spirited away to the remote isle of St Kilda, gave out that she was dead and celebrated her funeral. Lord Grange was in fact one of those persons who to their own content can combine zeal of religion, unscrupulous ambition, and the grosser appetites of sense.'

The story of Lady Grange is tragic. In her early years she moved freely in the society of Edinburgh. Her sudden disappearance caused consternation among her many friends. Her father had shot Lord President Lockhart in a fit of revenge for his having given a verdict against him ; and she inherited his fiery weaknesses to no small degree. Married life became intolerable after about twenty years, during which period she frequently ridiculed her husband in public. When about 1730 Lord Grange became involved in Jacobite plots along with Lovat and the Earl of Mar, she threatened to disclose his activities to the Hanoverian authorities. And so Lord Grange, with the aid of MacLeod of Dunvegan, determined upon her 'sequestration.' Lovat's henchmen kidnapped her in Edinburgh ; and, although it was whispered in that City that she had been abducted, a mock funeral with a coffin filled with stones is one of the several traditions associated with her name. It appears that her own sons, now grown to manhood, made no endeavour to find her. On the pretext that she was the victim of insanity, she was dragged across Scotland to Heiskeir, one of the lonely islands lying some miles to the west of North Uist, belonging to Sir Alexander MacDonald of Sleat. There she remained for the space of three years. MacLeod's still lonelier outpost of St Kilda received her in 1734.

Not a soul on St Kilda knew a word of English with the exception of the catechist ; and it is doubtful whether she ever saw a stranger other than MacLeod's factor when

he went over for a few days each year to collect the Islanders' rents. She made several attempts to escape from St Kilda, which Island she described in one of her letters, still extant, as 'a neasty, vile, stinking, poor ile.' When the catechist was leaving St Kilda in 1741, she gave him certain letters to be handed to her agent, Hope of Rankeillor, who upon receipt of them immediately applied for search warrants, and strove for the arrest of MacLeod and his accomplices. However, the warrants were refused, largely on the grounds, it is believed, that the letters were alleged to have been in the handwriting of the catechist. Meanwhile Hope of Rankeillor set out for St Kilda with a sloop, accompanied by the catechist and a score of armed men. But when MacLeod was apprised of their move, he straightway transferred Lady Grange to Harris, and thence to Skye. She died in a miserable hut at Trumpan, in the Isle of Skye, in the year 1745, just a decade after her 'sequestration.'

I have an idea that some years ago the Earl of Mar had a monument erected to her—possibly in compensation for the dastardly part played by his ancestors in her abduction and retention on St Kilda. When staying at Dunvegan Castle some years ago while collecting material for my 'Over the Sea to Skye,' I was much interested in the relics preserved there that are associated with Lady Grange. Even yet one may examine at Dunvegan the yellow, time-seared accounts rendered in respect of her board on St Kilda and of her funeral expenses in Skye. At Dunvegan also is preserved the lamp that dimly illumined the primitive dwelling in which she was detained for some seven years. It is a low iron receptacle, somewhat like a flat cream-jug, with a long, upright handle. In the receptacle oil was placed, and a miserable light was produced by a wick that floated in the oil.

Remoteness has always lent to St Kilda a unique romance. The St Kildans realised how far they were from the centre of things—so much so, indeed, that when they wanted to refer to some great distance such as lies between Land's End and John o' Groat's, they used to resort to their old adage, '*A Hirt gu Peart*,' meaning 'from St Kilda to Perth.' For generations Perth was considered the nucleus of the Northern Kingdom, owing perhaps to its proximity to Scone, where the Kings of Scotland were

crowned after Kenneth MacAlpin had removed his court from Dunstaffnage. Isolation has engendered in the St Kildans an independence and an absolute contempt for governmental supervision. But, though they have been a law unto themselves, they are by no means a lawless people. The Islanders have never figured on the crime-sheets of the County of Inverness. Nor have they ever recorded a parliamentary vote in the approved fashion. The franchise has meant less than nothing to them. The only administrative council in which they exhibited the least interest was their own *Mòd* or Parliament. Weather permitting, the St Kilda Parliament convened in the open—usually in front of the village post-office—so that some of its members might seat themselves on the steps of the post-office, while others might huddle together on the wooden form that stood against the wall of the post-master's cottage. The official language of this assembly was Gaelic: all other languages were *verboden*. It dealt with everything affecting the life of the community. Outside St Kilda its members had no real interest except the welfare of their relatives in the south. Their foreign policy did not extend farther afield than the neighbouring Island of Boreray; and even then it was solely concerned with sea-birds and sea-birds' eggs and sheep. The business of the 'House' was always conducted in a friendly manner; and the tactics of 'obstructionists' have never imperilled its policy.

Matters were brought to a climax when in February of last year a St Kildan woman, Mary Gillies to name, took ill, and the lighthouse vessel, 'Hesperus,' was unable to take her off to hospital owing to heavy seas. Mary Gillies afterwards got off on the 'Norna'; but she died in Stobcross Hospital, Glasgow. Does it not seem strange that, despite the advances this age has witnessed in the means of communication and transport, isolation should have demanded in the year 1930 the removal of the last remnant of a civilisation from this lone Atlantic outpost to more accessible parts of the mainland of Scotland?

ALASDAIR ALPIN MACGREGOR.

✓ Art. 10.—THE FUTURE OF AUSTRIA.

Self-Determination for Austria. By Dr F. F. G. Klein-waechter. Allen and Unwin, 1929.

WHEN, after the collapse of the Habsburg monarchy, the founders of the Republic gave the name of German-Austria to that part of the Austrian Empire inhabited by Germans, they gave expression to an historical fact. Austria of pre-War times embraced many lands and many peoples. There was a Polish-Austria, a Ruthenian-Austria, a Czech-Austria, a Slovenian-Austria, a German-Austria, and even an Italian-Austria. The Emperor Charles's title was Emperor of Austria, King of Hungary, Bohemia, Dalmatia, Croatia, Slavonia, Galicia, Archduke of Austria, Duke of Salzburg, Styria, Carinthia, Carniola, Markgrave of Moravia, Furst-Graf of Tyrol, etc. Unfortunately, either because they were ignorant of what was implied in the word Austria, or because they wanted to saddle the Germans of Austria with the sole responsibility for the War, the Peace Plenipotentiaries insisted on calling German-Austria Austria. For doing so they had no historical justification. The original Austria or Osterreich, out of which the Austrian Empire had grown, consisted merely of the two provinces of Upper and Lower Austria or Austria above and below the Enns. Such a country as Austria, except in this limited sense, never existed. Austria was simply a shortened form for Austrian Empire. For the outside world everybody who lived in the Austrian Empire, no matter whether he was a Pole, or a Czech, or a German, was an Austrian. To-day the name is restricted to the inhabitants of the Republic of Austria. But no one in Austria calls himself an Austrian. He is either a Viennese, and every third man in Austria is a Viennese, or a Styrian, a Carinthian, a Salzburger, an Upper Austrian, or a Tyrolese. He has not the same feeling for Austria that the Magyar has for Hungary. His patriotism is more or less local in character.

Austria is a Federal State consisting of a number of provinces. Each province has its own local parliament or Landtag, and how perfectly independent each province feels itself to be was evident when, immediately after the

Treaty of St Germain and the dismemberment of Tyrol, the district of Lienz began to describe itself officially as 'Deutscher-Gau-Osttirol.' It was equally apparent when, after the refusal of the Powers to allow Austria a plebiscite, Tyrol followed by Salzburg, in defiance of the Federal government, held one on their own account. It was even more apparent when the people of Carinthia, against the express orders of the Bundesrat, forcibly ejected the Jugo-Slavs from Völkermarkt and, by their recalcitrance, obliged the Allies to grant a plebiscite, which resulted in the rectification of the boundary between Carinthia and Jugo-Slavia. The one thing all Austrians have in common is their language. They are all Germans, and their one desire and aim is to be reunited to Germany. It is important to bear these facts in mind, for they explain much in the present state of Austrian affairs that would otherwise be incomprehensible.

In the November of 1929 the Republic celebrated its tenth birthday—if the scanty notices in the newspapers recalling the circumstances of its birth can be called a celebration. Beyond the fact that it was still alive no one in Austria was much interested in the event. But by the outside world, and particularly by France, the tenth anniversary was hailed with delight. It was an unmistakable sign of Austria's vitality. The Treaty of St Germain was justified. But was it? Few Austrians are of this opinion. On the contrary, they are convinced that Austria is rapidly approaching another crisis in her affairs, and that unless something is done, and that speedily, to repair the damage inflicted on her by the Treaty of St Germain, her continued existence as an independent State is becoming very problematical. To the casual visitor to Vienna, strolling through the Kärntnerstrasse and Graben, this may not be very apparent. Surely, he will say to himself, as he looks at the well-dressed crowds and the expensive goods displayed in the shop windows, this can't be a decaying city. But those who know Vienna know that all this appearance of wealth is largely sham and that the glory that still rests on Vienna is merely the glory of the setting sun. Vienna was the creation of the Habsburgs, and with the passing away of the Empire she has lost her *raison d'être*. Vienna, Palacky said, must never be

allowed to sink to the level of a provincial town. And yet this is just what, under Czech pressure, the Treaty of St Germain has done for her. The mischief is irreparable. Prague can never take her place as a civilising influence for Eastern Europe. Even now she attracts more visitors than Prague does. But it is useless to tell us that she is in a flourishing condition. Prosperity is a relative term. A man may have a balance to his credit with his banker and still be in a bad way. He may be denying himself many things necessary for his well-being and yet figure as a rich man. This is precisely the state of Vienna. To judge from the 3,500,000*l.* invested by the City Council in banks and other industrial undertakings, Vienna is a fairly rich town. But what is the good of this money if it has been accumulated at the expense of the welfare of her citizens; if, with an ever-decreasing population, taxation has risen during the last five years from 1*l.* 5*s.* per head to 2*l.* 10*s.*; if her industrial life is being thereby crippled and her intellectual and artistic life crushed out of her? This, as Dr Kleinwächter remarks in his excellent little book 'Self-Determination for Austria,' is the crux of the Austrian problem.

It is not that wages are too high, nor that thousands of families are living practically rent free, nor that the pensions paid to former officers and State officials are absurdly extravagant, that lies at the bottom of the problem, but want of employment. As Dr Kleinwächter puts it :

'The State is not in a position to earn enough to maintain its inhabitants on their former cultural level. . . . We see it most plainly in the State's finances. They have been put in order, but it was possible only by a drastic reduction of expenditure. In accordance with a natural economic law, these reductions first of all affect things that are not actual necessities of life—that is, all cultural activities. Our educational institutions, such as universities, technical colleges, and secondary and elementary schools, are suffering severely from restrictions on their expenditure. . . . Salaries are now so low that it is extremely difficult to secure the teachers needed by our universities. . . . The libraries can no longer buy even the most indispensable books. Art institutes, such as picture-galleries, can buy no new works.

The theatres are rapidly deteriorating. In short, in every department of cultural life one finds either retrogression or at best stagnation. . . . And this lowering of the cultural level also reacts on the economic situation. Badly trained engineers and business men mean lower profits from industry and trade. This in turn lessens tax-paying power and reduces the revenue of the State, compelling still further economies.'

Austria to-day is perhaps the heaviest taxed country in Europe, but of those who pay the taxes 78 per cent. have an income of less than 130%. It has been calculated that there are a million too many people living in Austria. Of these a quarter are subsisting on doles: the rest are just able to eke out a miserable existence. Heavy taxation is no doubt necessary if the State is to exist at all. But with every effort to balance income and expenditure Austria is sinking deeper and deeper into debt. In 1927 her imports exceeded her exports by over 6% per head of her population. These facts have created a difficult and rather dangerous situation. For if, as is evident, the State is only being kept alive by taxing industry to its utmost limit, there is no inducement for industrialists to continue their activities. Austria, we must remember, is essentially a peasant republic; but of her six and a half million inhabitants nearly a third live in Vienna and other industrial towns. Vienna is a state in itself, and it is Vienna that dominates the situation. Unlike the rest of Austria, which is a thoroughly Catholic and conservative country, Vienna is in the hands of the Socialists. We need not stay to inquire how this came about. But the result is that Austria is rent from top to bottom into two contending factions—the Christian Socialists and the Social Democrats, the one with their Heimwehr, the other with their Schutzbund.

Between these two factions there is a constant feud going on, which is continually leading to armed encounters not unattended with bloodshed, of which the often exaggerated reports in foreign papers are causing great damage to Austria's reputation as a tourist resort. Every attempt of Government to reconcile them has proved futile, and all that can apparently be done is to keep them apart as much as possible, and this in itself causes a great expenditure of unnecessary money. No

wonder if, in the circumstances then, Monsignor Seipel, after having saved the Republic from its outside enemies, gave up the problem in despair and retired from his post of Bundeschancellor. No wonder, too, if the efforts of his successor, Dr Streeruwitz, are proving not much more successful and if the call for a Dictator is growing ever louder. But even if a Dictator were forthcoming, of which fortunately there is no likelihood, it would not be of much use. A Dictator might restore order in the State. He might deprive the Socialists of their trump card—the *Mieterschutz Gesetz*; he might equalise taxation; but he could not remove the causes of Austria's economic distress. And Austria's economic distress lies at the bottom of the problem.

As everybody by this time knows Austria's economic distress is due, really and truly, to the Treaty of St Germain, which not merely deprived her in large measure of the raw material she requires for her manufactures, but took from her the market she formerly possessed for the disposal of her goods. No one, as Dr Kleinwaechter remarks, can understand Austria's present situation, who is unacquainted with the position she occupied in the old Austro-Hungarian monarchy.

* That monarchy was an economic unit containing nearly fifty-two million inhabitants. Its geographical character varied more, almost, than any other area of equal size. It contained broad plains and high, snow-capped mountains. Rich deposits of coal and iron were the basis of important heavy industries, agriculture flourished in great fertile districts. Salt, petroleum, and wood nourished industry and trade. In the great city of Vienna, whose extraordinarily favourable geographical position at the centre of the Empire had been supplemented by an excellent railway service, were all the conditions of a highly developed manufacture of high-quality wares and a network of banking and business organisation encompassing the entire land. . . . The partition of the monarchy by the Treaty of St Germain, which was made on the basis of political and not economic considerations, broke this great economic unit to pieces in a senseless manner. . . . The newly created States and the already existing ones that received portions of the monarchy's territory were bound for political reasons to make the severance as thorough as possible. Their aim was complete independence of Austria.

But there can be no political independence without economic independence. They were compelled to create industries to produce those things which they had formerly imported from the German-Austrian territory. In order that these industries might come into existence and continue to exist they had to be protected against German-Austrian industry, and this was possible only by means of high import duties and import prohibitions. . . . But military reasons also played a decisive rôle in shaping the economic policies of the Succession States. . . . Thus to give but one example, Czecho-Slovakia cannot permit herself to be dependent on Austria for her coaches, locomotives, automobiles, and electro-technical requirements, since in case of war Austria might not deliver these articles and the Czecho-Slovakian army would therefore soon be unable to fight. . . . The situation was fully realised by the League of Nations experts, T. W. Layton and Ch. Rist, who visited Austria to study methods of ~~dealing with her~~ economic distress. But since the economic problem is really a political problem, they did not venture to speak openly about it, but contented themselves with saying that the problem was one that involved much more than merely the Austrian question; that it was a European question. And as to this the experts declared—in so many words—that they did not think themselves justified in making concrete suggestions.

What, then, is to become of Austria? There is no question that the 650,000,000 of gold kronen that the League of Nations poured into her lap enabled her to stabilise her currency and to develop her resources. But they did not solve the problem of her existence. Everybody knows that a loan may help to tide a State over its difficulties, if those difficulties are only of a temporary nature, but not if they are chronic. Austria's difficulties are chronic. To-day she is anxiously expecting another loan of \$100,000,000, and when that is exhausted, if she ever gets it, she will want another. How can it be otherwise?

But why, it is often asked, cannot Austria become another Switzerland? Her scenery is equally attractive and she has more natural resources than Switzerland. Granted; but we must remember that Switzerland has advanced from a union of small peasant republics to her present position, as an industrial and tourist country, by her unremitting exertions, extended

over more than a century. It is another matter to reverse the process and to ask from Austria, which was till yesterday the industrial and administrative centre of a great Empire and handicapped as she is in a measure by the existence of Vienna, to imitate her example. Switzerland is like a man who has risen to wealth by his life-long industry. Austria is like a man who has suddenly lost his fortune and is compelled to begin life afresh with diminished energy and fewer resources.

Before the War no one in Austria dreamt of making the country a resort for tourists. Strangers came to Vienna to enjoy themselves in a congenial atmosphere. Students of all nations flocked thither to study medicine, art, and music. Vienna was a cosmopolitan city, where East and West met together in perfect harmony. But for the world at large Austria was practically an unknown country. Its peasants were indifferent to strangers, or rather they disliked them. Its hotel accommodation outside Vienna, Salzburg, and Innsbruck was of a very primitive sort. Now, if Austria is to become a centre of tourist traffic, all this must be altered. The beauties of its scenery must be revealed by costly propaganda. Hotels, answering the requirements of travellers accustomed to the luxurious establishments of Switzerland, must be built. Roads suitable for motor traffic must be constructed. Golf-links, tennis-grounds, etc., must be laid down. But all this requires money, and Austrians have no money to spare for such purposes. Not that Austria is without resources of her own or that her people are lethargic. What she has accomplished within the last few years is really astonishing. Travelling in Austria is more agreeable than it is in either Czecho-Slovakia or Jugo-Slavia, the accommodation better, and English is rapidly becoming the second language of the country.

In many respects Austria is better off than Switzerland. She has a superfluity of iron ore and a small steel industry of excellent quality resting upon it. She can construct her own railways, locomotives, and railway carriages. She has plenty of wood for building purposes and for the manufacture of paper, furniture, and musical instruments. She is well provided with leather for the production of those articles of galanterie for which

Vienna is famous, and in her rivers and waterfalls she has an almost unlimited supply of electrical power, which is making her more and more independent of the coal she has still to import. Thanks to intensive farming, she is also becoming more independent in the matter of foodstuffs. In consequence of three successive good harvests she was in 1927 able to cover her requirements in this respect to 86 per cent. She has more cattle than she needs. Her milk production grew from 600,000,000 litres in 1919 to 2,090,000,000 in 1927, and she is able to compete with the best cheese-manufacturing countries. Her beet industry has increased from 7500 waggons in 1919 to 55,058 in 1927, and she is now able to produce 65 per cent. of all the sugar she wants. We mention these facts not because they are a sign of Austria's increasing prosperity, for, as we have seen, her financial position is growing weaker year by year; but to show that she is not devoid of certain resources which, if they are properly utilised, may enable her to recover from the blow the Treaty of St Germain inflicted on her.

What Austria wants is capital to develop her industries and a market for the disposal of her products. Where is she to find them? There is not much use now in discussing the Treaty. It may be, as Dr Kleinwaechter argues, that the Allies had no moral right, in view of the doctrine of self-determination, to forbid Austria's union with Germany. But, as Burke has taught us, politics has nothing to do with right or wrong. It is a simple question of expediency. What is expedient is right: what is inexpedient is wrong. The question is, was it expedient to forbid Austria's union with Germany? Regarding the problem from this point of view, it may seem to some of us that the Peace Plenipotentiaries rather missed their opportunity, and that if, instead of splitting up the Empire in the fashion they did, they would have done better for the future peace and prosperity of Europe, if they had treated Austria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and perhaps Croatia as an economic unit, and while conceding to each of them full political autonomy, to have insisted on the retention of a common currency and a common railway system and to have provided against the establishment of hostile tariffs between them. It is now too late to retrace our steps.

As Dr Kleinwaechter has shown, it is practically impossible, for political and military reasons, to construct what is called a Danube Confederation. If this is so, and if it is impossible for Austria to exist as an independent State out of her own resources, what remains, if she is not to collapse, but the Anschluss on Germany?

In 1919 it was deemed inexpedient to allow it. The distrust of Germany was then too great. But the situation is no longer what it was when the Treaties were made. Germany is a member of the League of Nations. She has given every possible proof of her peaceful intentions. We have expressed our belief in her sincerity by evacuating the Rhineland. Article 88 of the Treaty of St Germain permits an appeal to the Council of the League. Why, then, not let Austria appeal if she wants to do so? Why deny her the right of self-determination? Remembering all that Austria, and above all Vienna, has done to promote civilisation and by her music to lighten the burden of life for each one of us, are we not bound in gratitude to answer her appeal for justice?

ROBERT DUNLOP.

(NOTE.—Owing to the deeply regretted death of Mr Dunlop, this article could not have the benefit of his revision. He was at work upon it when he died.—ED. 'Q.R.')

Art. 11.—THE MEANING OF MONASTICISM.

NOT long ago, a very new book was put into my hands, which, they told me, dealt with monasticism as its main theme. The author starts from the thesis that, 'the lunatic asylum always excepted, we can study early man to better advantage among monks and beggars than anywhere else.' This thesis he elaborates in terms which leave no doubt as to the 'beggars' whom he thus co-ordinates with lunatics and monks. He describes a group of three tramps whom he had once met upon a desolate road; creatures scarcely human: 'a terrible ape-like hair grows upon their lopped and twisted limbs; they seem like an attempt at a vegetable man which has been manufactured and cast aside as soon as finished.' And thence he promises to make us understand monasticism by bringing us down 'the road of common experience'; common, that is, to this semi-vegetable tramp and of the monk. Most of us, if we thus conceived of the cloisterer, might well feel that even the red and raging eye of Mr Robert Montgomery's imagination need pry no farther into monastic history. Yet, under this exaggeration, there does lie a certain commonplace truth; for the mediæval monk is often conceived, among the general public, as an abnormal creature. And this has come about naturally enough; for we may almost say of monasticism what Hallam said of freemasonry, that it has seldom been described except by apologists or by adversaries, both equally mendacious.

The fault, however, is not in any lack of public interest; mediæval buildings and their traditions have been enormously popularised by the motor-car and photography. 'The modern steam-puffed traveller,' as Ruskin called him fifty years ago, is now multiplied ten-fold by the oil-puffed excursionist; and even the dullest of these visitors, in face of some great ruin, can scarcely fail to ask, more or less articulately, 'What mean ye by these stones?' To this question even the most mawkish of local guides, and the most feebly imaginative, will suggest an answer which can scarcely go farther astray from the truth than, on the other side, does that comparison of lunatic asylums and tramps. Yet the influence of these guide-books, and of a good many more pre-

tentious volumes which attract the public by their cheapness of price and of thought, tends naturally towards that exaggeration which Mr Kipling has called the plaster saint. In this field, as in others, the two extremes stand out crudely, and are easy enough to paint. The real difficulty is to seize the features of that average man who, after all, shows us the real type. Every great institution has its notable extremes of good or evil; that which we most want to grasp is what is hardest to put into words, or even to focus in thought. What sort of being was this average cloisterer? What sort of life did he or she lead, day in, day out, as compared with ourselves and our own lives? Let us face these monks directly, and by the directest method, starting not from any assumption of their strangeness, but rather assuming their likeness, their almost identity, with ourselves.

What mean ye, then, by these stones? Even in Oxford, where local stone has been plentiful in all ages, we may trace in the walls many fragments carried off from Oseney or Rewley or St Frideswide's or the friaries. Those friaries were the first Oxford colleges; and other monastic ruins have furnished forth not only the sites but sometimes the very stones of later foundations. These stones have as definite a lesson to teach as those which Joshua set up beyond Jordan to mark the hand of the Lord. They tell of a tragedy none the less real because the hearer's sympathies may be very sharply divided, as in our civil wars of the seventeenth century or in the French Revolution.

Let us start on our inquiry with the briefest possible notice of what has been said concerning English monks by men whose intimate knowledge, or whose wide and philosophic outlook, may claim our special attention. We will begin just two centuries before the Dissolution. We could, of course, begin much earlier; but it will suffice to take one witness from before the Black Death, which is commonly but falsely represented as marking a clear and decisive epoch in monastic history. As a matter of fact, there is no characteristic of any importance, during the two monastic centuries after 1348, which was not strongly marked in the two centuries before; indeed, even in such matters as the numerical decrease of monks

or the increase of debt, the real wonder is that the Plague should have made so little difference. Shortly before the Black Death, then, the Cambridge Canon Lawyer John of Ayton interrupts himself to remark that the monks of his day seem definitely to have left the narrow path of salvation for the broad road of perdition ; he enumerates some of the main clauses of the Rule, and assures us that none is truly kept. A century later than this, we have three witnesses whose word is the more valuable because all three were public opponents of Lollardy, and two of them very violent opponents. Thomas Netter of Walden, who usually faces Lollard criticism with unshaken intrepidity, loses his boldness on this monastic field. He confesses that there is indeed much to be amended, and only pleads that the whole body should not be condemned indiscriminately. Bishop Pecock, his younger contemporary, is even more hesitating ; he can only argue that the cloisterer, on the whole, is a better person than the average uncloistered layman ; a testimonial which loses much of its face value when we read on, and discover what sort of character Pecock gives to the lay society of his day. In between these two, a little younger than Walden and a little older than Pecock, comes the famous Oxford Chancellor Thomas Gascoigne. The monks, he says, have absorbed a vast share of the parochial revenues ; and such religious or philanthropic work as they do is not sufficient to justify this absorption : therefore it would be no more than equitable if those who do so little to justify their rich endowments should now be disendowed, partially at least, in favour of better workers in the Lord's vineyard. Less than a century after Gascoigne we come to Sir Thomas More. He is even more embarrassed by the directness of the attack than Netter and Pecock had been ; he is concerned to say all that he can against iconoclasts like Tyndale ; yet, of his own accord, he tells two stories which would render a modern writer suspect of anti-clerical bigotry ; and, in the last resort, his defence of the monks is half-hearted. You must not condemn all indiscriminately, he says, just as Netter had said before him. Again, he asks how many of the critics would care to live a real monk's life ; as though one man's negligence could be justly condoned by pleading the negligence of others who had never

pledged themselves to any such duty! More's 'Dialogue' and 'Apology' explain, quite as clearly as Fysh's and Tyndale's criticisms, why that generation witnessed the Dissolution of the Monasteries. But, as I have said, the tragedy of their fall was felt deeply. In spite of some natural mockery, there is probably less written against the monks between 1530 and 1630, than in any of the four centuries before. It was a *chose jugée*; those who welcomed the overthrow had not always reason to boast; while those who deplored it were silent, partly through fear, partly because they had no more credible reasons to advance than those which had already proved unavailing. There were, indeed, a few small treatises written, which in later generations have been printed, in defence of the suppressed monasteries; by far the best of these is the so-called 'Rites of Durham.' Yet we must always discount an old man's story of what he thinks he remembers from his boyhood—*aut videt aut vidisse putat*—just as we must discount the impatience of those who, amidst all the agony of revolution, ask passionately whether it would not have been better, after all, to leave the old abuses alone. But revolutions settle down; then at last it is possible to strike some real balance; and seventeenth-century England saw no reason to envy those other countries where monasticism still bestrode the narrow world like a colossus. Some antiquaries, it is true, continued to sigh for the past, often giving reasons which are demonstrably false, as John Aubrey does again and again. Poets, again, recognised all that was elevating or picturesque: Shakespeare in his 'bare ruined choirs, where late the sweet birds sang,' Milton in his 'pensive nun, devout and pure,' and his 'studious cloisters pale.' But the prose Milton, the political thinker, Milton of the 'Areopagitica,' voices the deliberate judgment of thoughtful England, after a full century of experience. He looks back upon the vanished mediæval world as Augustine looked back upon the Roman Empire. Monasticism might indeed have been the *παιδαγωγός* to bring society to Christ; but time has brought maturity. To some souls, no doubt, these religious vows are still, and always will be, a welcome support, but the world in general has outgrown this 'cloistered and fugitive virtue.' And Milton's contemporary Selden, while freely recognising

the true achievements of the vanished abbeys, sturdily rejects the common superstition that any special curse had fallen on inheritors of monastic property, or any special blessing on monastic partisans. No doubt, sin may here bring its own final penalty, and virtue its own reward, but no more than in any other field of life. Everywhere Selden finds the same golden rule : ' If I do well I shall be blessed, whether any bless me or not.'

After Milton and Selden in the seventeenth century, let us take Johnson and Gibbon in the eighteenth as fairly representative of ripe thought among the English laity. Johnson came back again and again to this subject. He said to Boswell, in 1761, ' Men will submit to any rule, by which they may be exempted from the tyranny of caprice and of chance. They are glad to supply by external authority their own want of constancy and resolution, and court the government of others, when long experience has convinced them of their own inability to govern themselves.' And again :

' All severity that does not tend to increase good, or prevent evil, is idle. I said to the Lady Abbess of a convent, " Madam, you are here, not for the love of virtue, but the fear of vice." She said she should remember this as long as she lived.' ' I,' adds Boswell, ' thought it hard to give her this view of her situation, when she could not help it ; and, indeed, I wondered at the whole of what he now said ; because, both in his " Rambler " and " Idler," he treats religious austerities with much solemnity and respect.'

There Johnson shows the balance and common sense which are his general characteristics. He admired resolute self-denial as it deserved ; you will find that plainly in the context of these brief extracts. But this Tory's general verdict is that of the Radical Milton ; cloistered virtue is not the highest.

The little that Gibbon says is equally characteristic of the Gibbonian mind and manner ; familiar as the words are, I cannot resist the temptation of quoting a few sentences. He writes in his *Autobiography* :

' The College of St Mary Magdalen (it is vulgarly pronounced Maudlin) consists of a President, forty fellows, and a number of inferior students. It . . . may be compared to the Benedictine Abbeys of Catholic countries. . . . The

shelves of their library groan under the weight of the Benedictine folios, . . . which have issued from the single Abbey of St Germain des Prés. . . . If I enquire into the manufactures of the monks of Magdalen, if I extend the enquiry to the other Colleges of Oxford and Cambridge, a silent blush, or a scornful frown, will be the only reply. The fellows or monks of my time were decent easy men, who supinely enjoyed the gifts of the founder.'

After Gibbon came the Oxford Movement, a conscious reaction from the rationalism of which Gibbon was an apostle; and one natural result of that revival, which itself owed much to the romantic movement in literature, was a generous idealisation of the monastic system. Men were weary, and justly weary, of the irreflective and often ignorant abuse repeated from mouth to mouth, not only by what may be truly stigmatised as the Protestant underworld, but even from men who ought to have known much better. S. R. Maitland, in his 'Dark Ages,' nailed a good many lies to the counter; so that, when Dean Church described truly the admirable cloister-life of Bec in its palmiest days, then his readers naturally adopted this picture as the basis of their monastic ideas.

The upshot of all this is, that in the later Middle Ages monks were felt to be falling behind their times; that, after the Reformation, England soon found her balance again without them; that men of broad philosophic insight and common sense did not, on the whole, wish them back again; but that this general adverse verdict, however right in the main, involved minor injustices, and left room for reasonable protests. The Oxford Movement was a necessary and healthy reaction; the rise of Anglican monastic communities bears witness to a need strongly felt in individual cases; and even the cheap sentimentalism which gathers round ruins like Glastonbury, with its claim of messages through spiritualistic mediums, is some degrees better than cheap scorn and misunderstanding on the other side. But always we need to control our imagination by constant reference to facts and common sense; we need to study this past society, if we regard it as worth studying at all, with all our faculties in full balance; we need to ask impartially why the career which appeals to so few in our own day is that which was followed by so many in

the Middle Ages. For this purpose, we must begin as I have already suggested, and start from the similarities rather than the differences.

The monk's life, according to the Benedictine Rule, was one of continuous discipline, from above and from within. He was bidden to obey his abbot as Jesus Christ. A monastery was not reckoned as full-fledged, it was not *conventual* (to use the technical term) unless it contained at least thirteen members, answering to the Apostles and their Master. The Pope himself, it was finally decided by the Canon Lawyers, could not absolve a monk from his vow of obedience, any more than from the two other *substantialia*, the two other essential vows of poverty and chastity.* And the Abbot himself was bound by the Rule, though here he had wide dispensing power. The original aim was not to found a new order of clerics, but rather a group of layfolk who wished to save their souls, and who felt that this could best be done in community. It was only later that there came the multiplication of Masses, and therefore of priests, with the lengthening and complication of choir services; and these changes would probably have been disapproved by St Benedict. His plan was one of public psalmody and prayer for about four and a half hours of the day, with regular physical labour for the sake of bodily and mental health, and three or four hours of pious reading, and seven or eight of sleep. Food and drink were plain, but fully sufficient for health; wine was allowed; only butchers' meat was forbidden to all but the sick. The Rule is marked throughout by a spirit of healthy moderation; it enjoins no extreme asceticism; *mutatis mutandis*, it might almost be adopted by a modern colony of plain-living and hard-thinking folk at Letchworth or Golders Green. In so far as it differs from modern ideals, this is in its elaborate provision for common prayer, and in certain directions which may fairly be called puritanical. For instance, jesting and laughter are forbidden; and this prohibition was strongly emphasised by later commentators. Moreover, though there is no injunction of

* A loophole was found, however, in a logical distinction: the Pope might make a monk into a non-monk, thus absolving him from the whole vow at one stroke. But, short of this almost unheard-of action, no dispensation from any one of the *tria substantialia* was admitted.

absolute silence, yet strong stress is laid upon the duty of *taciturnitas*; and, again, all commerce with the outer world is forbidden, with exceptions which, literally accepted, must have been almost negligible. It was quite in the spirit of the Rule that later monastic disciplinarians insisted upon the interception of all letters to and fro, and that they forbade the monk to carry, or even listen to, tidings from the world outside—*rumores*. If, as a matter of fact, monks did become the busiest of mediæval chroniclers, and sometimes the most curious of gossips, this was not through their Rule, but in spite of it; this was the good side of those gradual and natural relaxations which, on the other side, transformed these apostles of poverty into the wealthiest capitalists of their day. If, then, there was so much that was reasonable in the Rule from the first, and if even its relaxations were so natural and so human, why are religious vows so much rarer nowadays in every country? This is due to changes, not in human nature, but in social conditions. For good or for evil, we live now in a very different atmosphere, both physical and moral.

The rougher physical conditions of the Middle Ages are sufficiently notorious: wars, pestilence, famine, robbers on the highroad and in the fields; and, even within the stoutest city walls, far more frequent reminders that here we have no abiding city. Let us not exaggerate, but neither must we minimise, the extent to which the monastery offered a refuge from physical terrors and discomforts. To put it epigrammatically, scarcely any English subject lived then in a stone house except the Knight, the Monk, or the Jew. But it is far more important to look to the spiritual side, especially since some of those factors are seldom brought before us with all the emphasis which they deserve. We may safely affirm that the standard mediæval ideas of heaven and hell differed more from those of even the most mediævally minded modern theologians, than present-day ideas on that subject differ between one Church and another. This fact seldom receives its full emphasis, and the reminder is especially necessary here. It was a commonplace of mediæval theology, and indeed of almost all theology until comparatively recent times, that the last moment of a man's life decided for him between an

eternity of unimaginable bliss (with or without preliminary purgatorial suffering) and an eternity of unspeakable horror and torment. This was accepted as an axiom so indisputable that St Gregory the Great, and, after him, all or almost all the Schoolmen, do not attempt to reconsider it even when it is found to lead them by inexorable logic to the conclusion that the Blessed in heaven will find their bliss heightened by the contemplation of the sufferings of the Damned in hell—only indirectly, of course; only as a proof of God's justice and as a reminder of His mercy to themselves—but still, the fatal nexus is there; the horrors of hell will sensibly increase the bliss of heaven. Such, then, are the everlasting issues which depend upon the man's last breath upon earth; and, at that moment, nothing will contribute so directly to the balance one way or the other, as his dying faith and his fortification by the rites of the Church. It was a natural complement to this, that even the most moderate and cautious of theologians—even Aquinas, for instance—took it for granted that many more men would be damned than saved. So far as academic theory and theological orthodoxy are concerned, it would be almost impossible to overstate the difference here between the mediæval and the modern atmosphere. In Samuel Butler's 'Erewhon,' where the notions of crime and ill-health are so ingeniously inverted, we shudder to hear a malicious person whisper behind her friend's back that, whereas the lady pretends to be only a dipsomaniac, she is really a slave of indigestion. Yet, to St Thomas Aquinas, it would have seemed even more preposterous to hear us say in tones of condemnation: 'That young man is always posing as a heretic, but you can see that he is invincibly ignorant.' That is a contrast which the reader must bear in mind throughout this article. The monk, whom we wish to understand, is, by nature, our own potential self. But he, like ourselves, has taken much of his colour from his surroundings.

Here again, however, we must beware of exaggeration. We know how, in all ages, men have been accustomed to admit, or even to assert in word, certain things; not frankly disbelieving them even in their own minds, yet readily forgetting or abandoning them under stress of those practical tests which compel us to decide suddenly

and definitely as to what we do truly believe. That difference between academic thought and common thought was certainly not less in the Middle Ages than in our own day ; and we must bear this in mind when we mark the damnable iteration with which Schoolmen and preachers and moralists harp upon heaven and hell. To a certain extent, their very emphasis betrays them ; they do protest too much. That is true ; but let us not exaggerate on the other side. We may justly discount the extent to which hell and heaven were efficaciously present to a man's mind for the greater part of his life ; but we must not minimise the change of his outlook in face of death. Mediæval moralists complain over and over again that many men gambled on the chance of a deathbed conversion : ' Three words will save me.' But it was on the deathbed that long-neglected beliefs came to their own ; then it was that bystanders were impressed, and relatives accepted as natural and inevitable that the man's last words should consecrate to the Church a considerable share of the family inheritance, quite apart from what the priest might take as his legal due. The strictest saints might indeed marvel that men could die with such comparative indifference, considering all that hung on the balance ; but to most men the last ceremonies were impressive enough.

There was a great deal more of unbelief in the Middle Ages—of scepticism in the strictest and most deliberate sense—than is often recognised. But the vast majority, in their most serious moments, had at least a devil's faith ; they believed and trembled. To the pure and pious soul of those days, it has been truly said, heaven seemed nearer than the roof of his own house. Yet St Bernardino complains, in so many words, that many other folk believed in nothing higher than their house-roof ; or, in Langland's words, ' of other heaven than here take they no tale.' If we turn away from these extremes of conspicuous piety or crude materialism, and fix our attention upon the ordinary decent person, such as we imagine ourselves to be, it is no libel on the Middle Ages to say that Satan was even more clearly visualised than God.

Such, then, is the ordinary decent person into whose skin we must try to think ourselves, a person by no means lacking in positive religion, whether natural or revealed ;

honestly admiring goodness and disliking wickedness ; rising, in his higher moments, to the contemplation of perfect goodness ; convinced that the Church sacraments, and especially Mass and Confession, bring him into personal relation with God ; a man divinely inspired, let us say, at his best, yet very humanly dependent upon natural hopes and fears. The monk's first business—it may almost be said, his first and his last—was to save his own soul. This, of course, did not exclude charity towards his neighbour ; far from it ; in saving others we save ourselves. But it is a question of emphasis, and from the great monastic disciplinarians we hear the same cry as from Bunyan : How shall I flee from this damnation ? In mediæval Latin, *religio* generally means some monastic Rule, and *conversio* nearly always means the taking of monastic vows. Into the best monasteries, in their best days, men were drawn by listening to their own conscience at its most serious moments ; into the ordinary monastery, at ordinary times, the larger part drifted by far more commonplace currents.

The golden age of the English monasteries is from the Conquest to Henry II inclusive. As the orderliness of monasticism appealed to William, so it did to the two Henries ; even under Rufus and Stephen, society was more peaceful than in most parts of the Continent. Therefore, in those five reigns, more than 300 abbeys or priories were founded ; this means, at a rough calculation, that the monastic population was trebled within a hundred years. Soon afterwards, the friars brought another very considerable accession of force, both in numbers and in spirit ; but, after that, there was no such marked movement in England as there was in parts of France and of Italy and of the Empire. Yet, if we had no such heroic reformers as the Continent could boast, this was because we never fell so low. It seems clear that monastic life, and Church life generally, and social life on all sides, kept a rather higher average of regularity in this country than in any other. There are not very many English names on the Church calendar, but our need for saints was seldom so desperate ; in England, it was only under Stephen that 'Christ and His Saints slept.' No country, I think, can show a better monastic record than this of the first English century after the Conquest. Never and nowhere

else, among so large a population, was there more of what Thomas Hardy called 'that crude enthusiasm without which great thoughts are not thought, nor great deeds done.' The disinterested altruist could do no better than to join these monks; on the other hand, what more remunerative investment could the most interested speculator find for himself, if not in the full vigour of life, at least on his deathbed, or by his testamentary dispositions? Everything, therefore, enlisted enthusiasm; and, at rare moments and in a few places, the flame burnt as fiercely as any recorded in history. The records of St Bernard's influence would be almost incredible, if they did not corroborate each other from widely different angles. If we had lived in his day and come under his personal influence, many would certainly have thrown in our lot with him; some of those who would least have expected it, and of whom it would least have been expected. Yet it might have been very difficult to quit the world; and certainly, to most of the converts, perseverance was harder still. The most remarkable sermon, in many ways, that I ever heard, was by the late Fr Figgis, from the Cambridge University pulpit. At the end of his written discourse, he spoke on for five minutes from his deepest soul, so intimately that the words will not be found in the printed report. He began: 'It has been said that the highwayman's motto is "your money or your life"; but Jesus Christ's is "your money *and* your life."' And he went on: 'The sacrifice is not easy, and it does not grow easier; it may even grow harder from day to day.' There he was practically repeating the experience of St Bernard, who wrote: 'It is far easier to find many worldly folk converted to good, than one monk pass on to something better. He is the rarest of birds—*rarissima avis in terris est*—who climbs but a little higher than the degree to which he may have attained in cloistered religion.'*

Many men have stuff in them which may explode with almost incredible force under certain conditions; but few possess that immense reserve which alone can maintain lifelong perseverance. Monastic history, naturally enough, is full of dramatic conversions. A Cistercian of the twelfth century had been a keen university student;

* 'Epist.' 96.

his dead master came back from purgatory to warn him ; one drop of sweat fell from the dead man's brow upon the scholar's hand, and burnt it to the bone ; thenceforth he abandoned his books, and studied only to save his soul in the cloister. Cæsarius, another Cistercian, gives a long list of the strange conversions he himself had known ; stories not only tragic but tragi-comic ; the thief fleeing to the cloister from his theft ; the adulterer from his adultery ; the debtor from his debts ; the knight, conquered in duel, to escape from his conqueror. Such revulsions of feeling, such sudden agonies of terror, with their natural recrudescences even when the shelter of the cloister had been secured, are common enough in all monastic records of all countries and of every age ; indeed, they are all the more eloquent for these diversities of time and place.

Therefore, much as it needed to convert many men, even in those days of greater impulse and less reflection than ours, it needed still more to maintain them anywhere near the point at which they had made their first vows. We cannot realise the facts unless we bear in mind the personal diversities which went to make up the corporate unity of a convent. Here, as so often, monasticism shows in their most marked forms the characteristics of the Mediæval Church in general. Nowadays, much as we owe of our religion to birth and breeding, free choice does come in very strongly, and different minds go different ways. Therefore, in the modern Churches, in spite of many diverse and more superficial manifestations which are due to modern freedom, the fundamental mass of each is more uniform ; Romanism consists more of natural Romanists, Anglicanism of natural Anglicans, and so on. But in the Middle Ages, when all were practically compelled to conform, that so-called unity embraced not only the potential Roman Catholic of to-day, but also the potential Anglican, Free Churchman, Quaker, Agnostic, or even the militant Secularist. Therefore, in the later mediæval generations, where so many men without real vocation drifted into the cloister much as a modern undergraduate drifts into the nearest accessible profession, those personal differences went far to break the nominal uniformity of the Rule. The dramatic convert might indeed keep up his enthusiasm, and hate this mere

earthly life, and run his race with heroic endurance to the last, falling upon death 'as the sobbing runner breasts the tape.' Yet he might, on the other hand, fall back among those who had scarcely pretended true conversion even to themselves, and to whom monastic disciplinarians would have applied those words of Jude: 'Clouds are they without water, carried about of winds . . . wandering stars, to whom is reserved the blackness of darkness for ever.' But, at present, neither of these two extremes is our chief concern. How far did the average man keep up with a Rule which, though moderate enough considering the circumstances, did in fact postulate a steadiness of self-denial and self-control which could scarcely be maintained without constant recollection of the terrible issues that hung upon obedience or failure?

St Bernard, indeed, did keep his converts not only from apostasy but even from notable relaxations; in those ways, his success was almost more remarkable than his power of winning them. But that was the success of one extraordinary man for one single generation; the general trend was what we might expect from human nature as we know it. The proportion of men born with a natural bent for pious contemplation and asceticism is not likely to vary appreciably from age to age. A wave of enthusiasm multiplied these ascetics in England by three, and, in a few other places, under leaders like St Bernard, by ten or by twenty. Their lives commanded admiration; the wealth from which they had fled as individuals was now heaped upon them as a community; then it began to stick like pitch to their fingers; so that men were soon tempted to enjoy greater comfort in the cloister than they would have had in the world. For this we have explicit and repeated testimony, sometimes in the very lifetime of those who, in their youth, had seen the first beginnings of apostolic poverty. It is easy to picture the heroes of the Cistercian or Franciscan or Dominican revival; again, it is painfully easy to picture monastic life at the other extreme, as revealed in the detailed reports and warning injunctions of episcopal visitors; but, it must be repeated almost to weariness, the real difficulty is in the average.

Yet this difficulty is vanishing, I think, under the intensive examination to which monastic records of all

kinds are now being subjected. It is laborious work to focus all these scattered details into a coherent mental picture; perhaps it is even harder to mould them into a verbal synthesis which shall supply evidence at every point without over-straining the reader's attention. But the longer men read and discuss the more abstruse documents, the more generally they seem to agree upon other easily-accessible and comprehensible records as typical. In the stricter sense, it is doubtless absurd to expect that we should find in any one book the average monk of the Middle Ages *tout craché*, to borrow the expressive French phrase. Yet, in a looser sense, sufficient for the practical purposes of the intelligent but non-specialist reader, we have several such books; and, perhaps by common consent, the palm would be given here to Jocelin of Brakelond. Jocelin's Chronicle presents the average monk very happily, as seen in one of the greatest and most orderly houses in Europe. This means that he was, in some ways, a good deal above the average; but still he was average, in the sense that an equally frank narrative from St Albans or Westminster would have given us much the same impression of monastic life, and that Ekkehard of St Gall and Guibert de Nogent give us the same impression from great abbeys in Germany or France. If, as has sometimes been remarked, Jocelin's monks of Bury show something of the mentality of the squire-parson, then in corresponding records from smaller houses we find the mentality of the yeoman-parson. But everywhere, I think, in nine cases out of ten, there was this very human tendency to settle down into institutionalism; then to let the institution crystallise into formalism; and, without forgetting heaven, to make the best of both worlds. Jocelin should be read daily and nightly by those who would understand the actuality, as apart from the mere theory, of monastic life. It will be necessary, of course, to avoid the application to Jocelin and his fellows of the *argumentum ex silentio*; nor is it necessary to suppose that they thought no more than they wrote concerning their solemn dedication to an almost superhuman ideal, or concerning that *Opus Dei*—those seven daily services—in which, quite apart from private prayer and from the night offices, it was their lifelong duty to serve God. Yet justice not only

permits, but demands, that we should ask, while we read his book, how far it shows their true detachment, as apart from professional and conventional detachment, from the things that are below; and their true attachment to the things that are above. We must ask also—and for this there seems abundant answer—how far they valued the enormous revenues and privileges of the Abbey for their own sake; how far for the sake of the good which those things might enable them to do to their neighbours.

Therefore, looking back at the material and spiritual characteristics of those centuries which elapsed between the break-up of Imperial Europe and the foundation of the new Europe, let us recognise that nothing was more natural than the birth of such an institution as monasticism; nothing more natural, again, than that the reaction should be as important as the action; than that this institution should gradually borrow even more from the great world outside than it had originally lent or given to that outside world; and, lastly, nothing more natural than that the tide of human history should finally leave the ship herself stranded high and dry, with her crew scattered among the life-boats. Let us, however, recognise our own selves in that one side of Abbot Samson, who confessed to Jocelin: 'If I could have been as I was before I became a monk, and could have had five or six marks of rent wherewith I could have been supported in the schools, I would never have been monk or abbot.' But, imagining ourselves as having drifted into the cloister more or less as Samson did, we may perhaps see ourselves reflected still more clearly in those who grumbled at the food, and who thought that the Abbey was going to the dogs because its tenants were becoming more well-to-do and independent. We may see ourselves, again, in those who refused to be righteous overmuch and to excite themselves unduly about the conduct of monastic business, 'considering that the chief religion of monks is to hold their peace, and pass over the excesses of their prelates.' And, clearest of all, we may recognise our kinship with those who were quite determined not to push their zeal for righteousness to suicidal extremes, preferring (in Jocelin's words) to go to heaven as confessors rather than as martyrs. Reading between the lines like this, we shall not be tempted to lose sight of whatever heroism

is recorded in this book ; we shall rather see the hero in his true stature, side by side with Jocelin and with ourselves. We shall see in Samson what Carlyle saw ; a man like Cromwell or Washington, with nothing in him of the stage hero, but driven on to great and greater deeds by his true-hearted acceptance of all the responsibilities which his privileges forced upon him.

Thus, without forgetting or minimising the super-human side of monasticism, we may also look behind this, comparing the monk with others who, without the same explicit profession, have pressed more or less directly towards the same goal. When we have chosen the very greatest of the monks, it would be rash to assert that these men lived with more profit to the world into which they had been born, or that they left it with souls better armed to play their part in a higher world, than others who might be chosen from widely different professions. There is very deep significance in what has been said of Henry Sidgwick, that he showed every Christian virtue except Christian faith. It is a thought which need not distress even those for whom the Christian faith outweighs all other virtues. For, as Plutarch said long ago : ' I would far rather a man should deny the existence of Plutarch, than that he should believe Plutarch capable of the deeds ascribed to Zeus and the other gods.' To a Christian, what is not virtuous is no true constituent of the Christian creed. Every generation needs to purge its own dross ; and, in so far as any faith leads a man to act wrongly, to that extent it must be a false faith. That was a very false element in mediæval faith which compelled philosophers to conclude deliberately that heresy is the blackest of all crimes, and to burn heretics in consistent obedience to that academic conclusion. In that respect, mediæval faith encouraged the herd-instinct in its most mischievous excesses ; excesses as unjustifiable as that Pharisaical herd-instinct which led logically to the crucifixion of Christ. And, even as mediæval faith came out at its strongest in the monastery, so also at its narrowest. It is monks themselves who tell us that men are seldom found better than in the cloister, and seldom worse ; worse not in actual deed, for almost at every time and in every place the average monk behaved better than the average outsider, but worse in comparison

with his profession and his opportunities. The monastery, therefore, while on one side it was conspicuous for class-enthusiasm, was on the other deeply tinged with class-selfishness. This comes out everywhere; it exudes at every pore; naïvely and amiably in a man like Jocelin of Brakelond, and almost ferociously in others. In mediæval life there were far more extremes than in modern, and it may be said that those extremes were greater in the monastery than elsewhere.

If history never repeats itself; if the historian has not the scientist's resource of multiplied experiment; if we cannot bring the same events together again and again, in order to see whether every similar combination leads to similar results, yet we can lay our finger more directly than the scientist upon the pulse of human life. The slightest hint of what has been said or done at other times by other men may come home more immediately to us—may flash the light or the heat far more directly from mind to mind—than any but the greatest of discoveries in natural science. As Carlyle has said, there may be a whole new world to us in the mere discovery that another man has thought and felt just as we do. Where two lives are joined in partnership, there is something far richer than the aggregate of two separate existences; where a man habitually thinks in terms not only of the seen but of the unseen also, there again the increase is not in arithmetical but in geometrical proportion. Matthew Arnold,* speaking in America, rehearsed the Oxford influences of his undergraduate days in terms which have since given inspiration to many others besides Oxford men. He recalled three voices, one alone a local voice, the other two world-wide, and with as clear a message as if they had been heard from living lips in Weimar or Scotland or Massachusetts. One voice was from Carlyle's translation of Wilhelm Meister; another, Newman's from the University pulpit, in his sermon on Trinity Sunday: 'After the fever of life; after wearinesses and weaknesses; fightings and despondencies; languor and fretfulness; struggling and failing, struggling and succeeding; after all the changes and chances of this troubled unhealthy state, at length comes death, at length the white throne of God, at length the Beatific Vision.' And

* M. Arnold, 'Discourses in America,' pp. 140-147.

the last was Emerson's exhortation to every honest and receptive soul: 'What Plato has thought, he may think; what a Saint has felt, he may feel; what at any time has befallen any man, he can comprehend.'

Have not all these words as much force to-day as they had nearly a century ago? A man may still possess Newman's concentrated enthusiasm, if he is willing to pay Newman's price for it; he may still attain to Emerson's balance, if he will weigh the opposites no less patiently than Emerson.

The great thing in life is stimulus; then the conscience finds its own direction. A man of Newman's character, in this present generation, might visualise heaven very differently, and yet devote his life with equal courage to an ideal no less disinterested and beneficent than Newman's. Again, we need not follow St Augustine in his belief that unbaptised infants suffer in hell not only the sense of loss but also the added torments of fire, in order to share Augustine's fundamental conviction that there is a power working for righteousness in human history; that our duty is not to act the past over again, but to rise above the past; that man's will may wrest final victory from the most crushing defeats; and that the true note to end upon is that from the Epistle to the Hebrews with which Augustine concludes his *De Civitate Dei*: 'There remaineth therefore a rest for the people of God.' For it is not that Emerson's ideal student *must* think with the great thinkers of the past, or *must* feel with the Saints, but only that he *may*, where conscience tells him that the pearl of price is hidden in that field. It is one of the commonest and most fatal historical anachronisms to forget that Plato or Aquinas could scarcely have thought in this present age exactly as they thought in their own, and that a modern Augustine or Bernard would probably feel somewhat less unsympathetically towards the modern Pelagius or Abailard. 'Prove all things, hold fast that which is good.' Coleridge recommended Jeremy Taylor with special emphasis to young divinity students, because they might acquire as much mental discipline by vigilantly noting his weaknesses as by following him in his strength. In the cloister also we shall find weakness as well as strength; and it rests only with ourselves to draw instruction from both sides.

G. G. COULTON.

Art. 12.—R 101 AND AFTERWARDS.

THE disaster to the British airship R 101 which involved such a heavy loss of life, shocked the nation profoundly, and not unnaturally has led to much adverse criticism of these aircraft. Even before this unfortunate occurrence, airships were somewhat suspect by the general public; this may be attributed in some measure to latent memories of the sinister Zeppelins of the War; but doubtless periodical catastrophes, as tragic as they were spectacular, have left an ominous impression. The result is a considerable body of opinion in favour of giving up this form of aviation entirely. Weight is added to the proposal by the argument that aeroplanes are, or soon will be, capable of doing all that is required more economically, more swiftly, and more safely than airships. It is questionable, however, whether a large number of those who criticise the latter have made anything more than a very superficial study of their achievements and of the causes of the calamities which from time to time have befallen them; yet it is not sound to condemn lighter-than-air craft without taking fair stock of their potentialities as well as of their failures and limitations. To begin with, the problem of conquering time and space is of ever-growing importance as a factor in maintaining the cohesion of the Empire. For this reason alone, every form of air transport which promises a practical solution deserves continual and close attention. Let us, therefore, examine the case for and against the airship, and see whether it can hope to establish superiority over the aeroplane in any particular respect, or whether it has inherent defects which should dispose of it once and for all as a practical means of communication.

It is of interest to go back to early days and trace the part which lighter-than-air craft have played in aviation. Without question it was the example of birds which first inspired man with the ambition to fly, and some of his earliest attempts to do so took the form of machines to imitate the action of wings. But he was soon faced with his inability to provide sufficient power to make artificial wings beat the air with the necessary force both to raise him from the ground and propel him in a given direction. Nevertheless, in 1891 Lilienthal con-

structed a man-carrying glider, and experiments with these machines resulted in a knowledge of balance which was to prove of great service when the power-driven aeroplane came into being. Many crude attempts were made to produce such an aircraft, but it was not until 1903 that the petrol engine enabled the Wright brothers to solve the problem of constructing a machine which would lift a passenger, and which could be propelled in a desired direction—in fact, something which might justly be called an aeroplane. But as early as 1783 a means had been found which would enable a man to ascend into the air. In that year, for the first time, a Frenchman named de Rozier went up in a free balloon, taking a passenger with him. In view of the danger of fire, so often associated with aircraft to-day, it is amazing to realise that this first human flight was effected by heating the air in the balloon with a furnace in the shape of a brazier slung beneath it and fed with straw. This primitive means of obtaining buoyancy was soon superseded by hydrogen gas.

In 1851 an airship in embryo made its appearance. This was the invention of Henri Giffard, and took the form of an elongated balloon. A five horse-power steam-engine gave a speed of four or five miles an hour in still air. But the airship, like the aeroplane, had to await the invention of the petrol engine for really efficient motive power. The year 1898 marks its true origin in anything which can be described as a practical form, and this was due to the great enterprise of M. Santos-Dumont and Count von Zeppelin. The former proceeded to develop the mobile elongated balloon, which became the non-rigid, or frameless airship; but von Zeppelin set out at once to build a vessel with a complete framework covered with fabric and silk, having internal gas bags and external motors—in fact, an airship which in its main features was the forerunner of the large 'rigid' of to-day. We see, therefore, that the airship was definitely ahead of the aeroplane, just as the balloon was in advance of the glider. Yet it is quite obvious that to-day the heavier-than-air craft has overtaken and surpassed its rival. But before it is claimed that the aeroplane has entirely superseded the airship, it is only fair to remember that expense has always told heavily against the more rapid

development of the latter. It is not only that the cost of construction has precluded experiments with new types of airships in anything approaching the same numbers that new aeroplanes can be tried out, but there is also the question of providing huge hangars and elaborate mooring masts—essential items on the material side. Again, operation and maintenance involve an almost continuous expenditure of hydrogen or helium in making good leakage and gas lost on flight, in addition to the cost of engine fuel which is common to both natures of aircraft. The necessary personnel must include a numerous crew for flying, and a large, periodically a very large, ground staff. None of these auxiliaries can be dispensed with, even by an airship which is merely being flown experimentally. The aeroplane, on the other hand, only requires a very small personnel whether for flying it in the air or handling and maintaining it on the ground, while provision for housing it is far less costly.

It is true that the War did hasten the development of airships, but not to the same degree as that of aeroplanes; moreover, aircraft design during that period was essentially governed by naval and military needs, which did less towards the post-war production of commercial airships than that of commercial aeroplanes. After the War, there was for some years a lack of continuous policy in the development of airships. The Navy, which had found them useful as part of the anti-submarine organisation, seemed apathetic. The small 'blimp,' together with such other auxiliaries as armed trawlers, motor-boats and patrol vessels, could find no place in an already dwindling fleet; the large airship had scarcely justified her existence as a fleet scout in the conditions of low visibility prevailing in the North Sea coupled with the menace of enemy aeroplane attack. The Royal Air Force was being drastically reduced, and the lighter-than-air side had a hard struggle for existence.

Nevertheless, one epoch-making event marked this period. In July 1919 the British airship, R 34, accomplished the first trans-Atlantic flight by any form of aircraft from East to West. Three days after her arrival in America she recrossed to England. The first West to East crossing, from Newfoundland to Ireland, had been made by an aeroplane just a month previously, but it

was nearly nine years later before an aeroplane flew from Ireland to an island off Labrador.* It is worth noting, too, that whereas the aeroplanes could only just carry two men the bare distance from coast to coast, the airship had a complement of over thirty and flew from the far side of Scotland to a predetermined destination in the United States and back to the Eastern side of England. Since that time ten trans-Atlantic and one trans-Pacific flights have been attempted by airships; every one of them has been successful. Details of these trans-oceanic flights are as follows :

TRANS-ATLANTIC FLIGHTS.

July 1919	. R 34	East Fortune, Scotland, to Long Island.
July 1919	. "	Return to Pulham, Norfolk.
Oct. 1924	. 'Los Angeles' (L.Z. 126)	Friedrichshafen to Lakehurst.
Oct. 1928	. 'Graf Zeppelin'	Return. " " "
Oct. 1928	. " "	Friedrichshafen to Lakehurst.
Aug. 1929	. " "	Lakehurst to Friedrichshafen.
Sept. 1929	. " "	" " "
May 1930	. " "	Seville to Pernambuco.
May 1930	. " "	Lakehurst to Seville.
July 1930	. R 100	Cardington to Montreal.
Aug. 1930	. "	Return.

TRANS-PACIFIC FLIGHT.

Aug. 1929	. 'Graf Zeppelin'	Tokyo to Los Angeles.
-----------	-------------------	-----------	-----------------------

It will be noticed that eight of these thirteen trans-oceanic flights have been performed by the 'Graf Zeppelin'; moreover, this airship is the first to have flown round the world. Her success is undoubtedly due to the years of experience which German designers possess, but it must be attributed no less to the unrivalled knowledge and skill of her commanding officer, Dr Hugo Eckener.

A comparison of the size and other important features of these airships is of interest :

* A Vickers Vimy biplane left St John's, Newfoundland, on June 14, 1919, and landed at Clifden, County Galway, the following day. The first East to West crossing by aeroplane was that made by a Junkers machine which left Baldonnell aerodrome, Dublin, on April 13, 1928, and landed on Greenly Island in the Straits of Belle Isle thirty-six hours later.

	Cubic Capacity.	Length.	Diameter.	Engines.	Crew.	Passengers.
R 34 . . .	1,950,000	643 ft.	79 ft.	Five 250 h.p. Sunbeams.	22	*
Los Angeles .	2,470,000	656 ft.	90½ ft.	Five 400 h.p. Maybachs.	25	20 (or 20 tons bombs)
Graf Zeppelin	3,708,000	771 ft.	100 ft.	Five 550 h.p. Maybachs.	26	20
R 100 . . .	5,000,000	709 ft.	133 ft.	Six 650 h.p. Rolls-Royce.	37†	‡

Airships have made many other long and successful flights which it would be wearisome to recount in detail, but a particularly notable example of steady transport work was that of the German 'Bodensee,' which in 1919 made one hundred and three voyages between Friedrichshafen and Berlin, and carried 2430 passengers without accident. A more modern example of endurance is that of the United States naval airship 'Los Angeles,' completed in 1924, used regularly for training and fleet work, and recently pronounced serviceable for another two years.

So much for some of the more remarkable achievements of airships; what of the other side of the picture? Neglecting war losses, and accidents to small non-rigids with which we are not immediately concerned, let us examine the post-war failures of large rigid airships, and see whether they may fairly be regarded as the price which must be paid for development, or whether they indicate some inherent disabilities which will inevitably frustrate the attainment of final success. First in this list of disasters comes the R 34, which, a year and a half after her record-making flights, came to an ignominious end by hitting high ground in thick weather. Before she could be got under cover, she was totally wrecked, but luckily there were no casualties. Following her loss, however, the Air Ministry closed down the whole military organisation of airships, and transferred them to the civil aviation side of that department. A far worse fate

* Crossed Atlantic with thirty-two persons on board.

† Five officers and thirty-two men on outward trans-Atlantic flight.

‡ Accommodation for one hundred passengers was part of the general project when R 100 and R 101 were designed. Such a load proved quite impracticable; on the return trans-Atlantic crossing there were fifty-six persons on board, including the crew, in R 100.

was that which overtook the French 'Dixmude'—formerly the German Zeppelin L 72. After completing a record flight of 118 hours in August 1923, in December of that year she set out on an extended cruise over the Sahara. She met bad weather, and after battling against it for several days, and being unable to reach any place where she could land with safety, she disappeared in the sea off Sicily. Her whole complement of fifty-four lost their lives. The Inquiry attributed her end to lightning.

Just a year later came the disaster to R 38, the British airship which was to be taken over by the United States. The vessel was carrying out rudder trials over the Humber in fine weather. At a speed of 54 knots the structure failed and she broke in two; the fore-part caught fire, while the after-part free-ballooned down into the water. The death-roll was forty-four. This accident was definitely ascribed to faulty design; but it caused a prolonged set-back to airship construction in this country. The United States Navy, however, continued to experiment, and in spite of the loss of the 'Shenandoah' in September 1925, that Service has never lost faith in the utility of large airships. The 'Shenandoah' was built at Lakehurst, mainly to the design of the German L 49. For what seem to have been chiefly political reasons, she was ordered to carry out a demonstration flight over the Detroit district. She ran into a violent line squall, which, according to the senior surviving officer, 'subjected her to enormous uncontrollable angle strains and rapid vertical ascent.' The ship broke up at 7000 feet; the three sections free-ballooned down and landed their twenty-seven occupants with only one casualty, but thirteen were killed in the falling cars. Thanks to the fact that the ship was filled with non-inflammable helium gas, there were no fires.

Lastly we have the recent tragedy of R 101. The airship, it will be remembered, set out from Cardington at about 7.30 p.m. on Oct. 4, bound for the Egyptian air base at Ismailia, en route for Karachi in India. When she left the English coast at about 10.30 p.m., it was raining hard and there was a strong south-westerly wind. The ship appears to have crossed the Channel at an altitude of not more than 1000 feet, but after making

the French coast it seems to have been the intention to maintain a height of 1500 feet,* and at 1 a.m. she reported that she was flying at that altitude in intermittent rain and cloud. There can be little doubt that from now onwards, if not before, increasing difficulty was experienced in keeping height, and the airship was steadily losing buoyancy and developing a tendency to nose-dive. Eventually this tendency, coupled perhaps with sudden gusts of what was already a strong head wind, proved too much for the elevators which were being used to try and drive the vessel up aero-dynamically, i.e. as an aeroplane gains altitude. When over high ground,† R 101 made two dives in quick succession; the first was checked, but the second brought her crashing to the ground. She caught fire, and forty-six of her complement, trapped in the passenger quarters and control cabin, perished in the flames; two succumbed later to their injuries; six escaped.

Reviewing these disasters in turn, we may dismiss the loss of R 34 as being comparable with that of many a fine ship of the sea which has lost her bearings and run ashore in a fog. The airship was 'well found' and had proved her quality on long and severe tests. The loss of R 38 was due solely to lack of knowledge, at the time, of strains to which an airship is subjected in the air. The same may be said to a large extent of the 'Shenandoah.' Research, experiments, and improvement in metals have resulted in very great progress in airship design, and the airship of to-day is incomparably stronger than her predecessors of that time. But the fate of the 'Shenandoah' and 'Dixmude' also emphasised the great importance of meteorology as an essential part of airship navigation. The lighter-than-air craft, with her huge surface, is particularly susceptible to strong currents of air. These may favour her, as a following tide speeds a

* This height was gauged by an altimeter—an aneroid barometer graduated in feet instead of degrees. This instrument would be set by the barometer reading at the place of departure, but would not be accurate unless corrected for the height of barometer at sea-level at the place where it was being used. In the case of R 101 the error would not have been great.

† This is only a relative expression. After crashing, the airship was found to be at a place on the map which was just within the 100 metres (325 feet) contour.

ship on her course over the ground ; * or they may impede her to such an extent that she can barely make headway ; but, unlike the ship at sea, she cannot anchor and wait for a change of tide. Nevertheless, the airship should often be able to profit by her ability to ascend or descend, or by using her comparatively great speed to avoid unfavourable weather. In order to do so, however, she must be given reliable meteorological reports. Very much has been done already towards increasing the number of observing stations, improving communications, and in charting the upper air ; but the whole science of air navigation is, in this respect, still in its infancy.

There is another lesson to be drawn from the loss of the 'Dixmude.' This airship, whatever the cause of her ultimate destruction, was the victim of circumstances in which she was like a ship on a lee shore, with no haven of refuge and her fuel giving out. The same predicament faces any big airship to-day which breaks down, or for any other reason cannot reach a prepared landing ground. The very large rigid cannot land safely unless there are elaborate arrangements to receive and moor her. At present, airship stations are so few and far between that any failure on a long overland flight must entail the loss of the ship. It follows, therefore, that before airships can operate in safety, many new mooring stations † must be provided ; alternatively these craft must be designed to land on water. This latter proposal will be alluded to again later.

Lastly, we come to R 101 ; and here it is not too much to say that of all the post-war accidents to airships, this one could and should most certainly have been avoided. The trials carried out before the ship set out on her ill-fated voyage were obviously hurried and inadequate, but even so they were sufficient to prove that the ship would be so heavy when fully loaded that she could not fly at a greater height than, at best, 2000 feet. In fact, it became apparent, directly after leaving the mooring

* The speed of a craft in the air or on the sea relative to either of those elements is not affected by a current ; it is the speed over the ground beneath which is retarded or accelerated.

† The only airship mooring masts in existence are those at the British stations at Cardington (Bedford), Ismailia (Egypt), Karachi (India), and St Hubert (Montreal), and those at the United States naval airship stations at Lakehurst and Hawaii.

mast for the last time, that it was only with difficulty that a height of 1500 feet could be maintained. Now, an airship flying over the land may be compared with a ship of the sea steaming along the coast. The mariner who elected to shape his course so as to keep within five hundred yards of the shore at night or in thick weather, especially in a ship the size of the 'Mauretania,' would be regarded as a species of criminal lunatic. All the more would this be so if the coast were ill lit, and wind and irregular currents were making the vessel unhandy, so that at any moment she might require plenty of sea room before she could be brought back to her course. Yet this is the exact counterpart of the situation in which R 101 found herself. Through no fault of her commanding officer she was unable to keep more than two ships' lengths from the general trend of an irregular and sparsely lit ground line; as she lost buoyancy her plight became worse and worse, until she became like an unseaworthy ship drifting ever nearer to a rocky shore. Whatever the finding of the Commission of Inquiry as to the technical reasons for failure, the fundamental fact remains that R 101 was never fit to attempt such a flight, and this should have been apparent, if not on trials, at any rate within a few hours of her departure. For political reasons she set forth on a venture which experts who really knew the ship and visualised what must be required of her, could only have viewed with the greatest apprehension. That this particular airship was designed to carry a hundred passengers to India, and proved quite incapable of performing the task; that she flew at a height which in the conditions prevailing was courting disaster, even if she had been completely airworthy; and that she proved unairworthy and came to grief with appalling loss of life does not make it logical to condemn airships as a whole. In fact, examining each of these failures dispassionately, none of them seems to point to any insuperable defect in lighter-than-air craft as a means of flying. Even so, much remains to be done before the airship can be regarded as safe. For instance, non-inflammable gas * and oil engines are indispensable, and,

* It seems probable that the United States will remove the embargo on the export of helium. That gas has also been found in Canada, and adequate supplies may, in course of time, be forthcoming from that Dominion.

while the structure must be strong enough to withstand all reasonable strains and stresses, the ship must be sufficiently buoyant to be able to ascend to at least 4000 feet, if need be, immediately on leaving the mooring mast, and of rising to a greater height if more favourable weather can thereby be found when in flight.

Having noted such essentials before airships can be regarded as efficient from a flying point of view, there still remains the question whether they have anything to commend them as a means of transport when compared with the aeroplane. The following are some of the principal considerations bearing upon the matter :

(a) Airships have already indicated their potentialities for luxury or emergency passenger and light cargo transport on trans-oceanic routes ; aeroplanes have not yet reached a stage when they can carry useful loads for anything like the same distance.

(b) With the materials now known to man, there is a point beyond which the aeroplane cannot be developed to do increased work, because beyond that point the less is the disposable lift it can carry, and therefore the less the distance it can fly.* But so far as can be foreseen, there are no insuperable difficulties to building and flying an airship double the size of R 101, and in the case of lighter-than-air craft lift improves directly with increase of cubic capacity.

(c) Failure of an aeroplane's engines means a forced landing ; over the sea this must result in disaster. No flying boat yet constructed could land in a normal sea in mid-Atlantic and take off again ; while in anything approaching bad weather it would speedily capsize or drown, even if it escaped immediate destruction. The airship usually has plenty of reserve of engine power, and may be able to effect repairs in the air.

(d) The proportion of the load-carrying capacity taken up by fuel is less in an airship than in an aeroplane ; this, combined with the greater size of the former, makes it possible to provide much more spacious and comfortable passenger quarters—a commercial factor which should prove to be of considerable importance for long continuous flights.

All this points to the airship having definite advantages

* Report of the United States Navy Committee, 1924, on 'The Inherent Limitations of the Aeroplane,' and Commander Sir Dennistoun Burney in 'The World, the Air, and the Future,' 1929.

over the heavier-than-air craft for trans-oceanic work. But for overland transport, it may well be argued that the aeroplane makes up in speed and economy what it lacks in carrying capacity and comfort. Very long continuous flights are not essential, as they are for crossing the Atlantic or Pacific, because prepared landing grounds are becoming more and more numerous, and the delay caused by refuelling is not a serious matter.

Apart from the expense of providing a large number of airship stations, complete with mooring masts, refuelling and re-gassing equipment and ground staffs, there are technical reasons which make it more difficult for lighter-than-air craft to fly over the land than over the sea. When an airship is required to gain height it is done partly by dropping water-ballast and partly by the use of the elevators; but the effect is that the ship passes into strata where the air is less dense. The pressure of the gas in the comparatively delicate bags must therefore be eased by 'valving,' i.e. a certain amount of gas, and therefore reserve of buoyancy, is lost. When it is required to descend again, as it may be necessary to do in order to fix the ship's position or to seek better weather conditions, more gas must be released. Temperature, which varies far more over the land than over the sea, also affects the density of the air, and passing through air of different temperatures will often necessitate discharging water-ballast or releasing gas. Water-ballast may be recovered while in flight, but not gas. The payload of an airship whose route is across very high ground must be appreciably lessened if she is to have the necessary lift. Over the sea the density of the air is, generally speaking, more equable, and, except for weather considerations, a steady height can be maintained.

The case for developing the airship for trans-oceanic work is strengthened by the fact that in so doing we may succeed in making up, to some extent, for the appalling shortage of cruisers to which we are committed by the London Naval Treaty. On account of their size and vulnerability airships are quite unsuited for land warfare, or for use within striking radius of enemy aerodromes; but for long-distance reconnaissance over the open seas they have much to commend them, if and when they are designed for this purpose. Incidentally, naval and

commercial requirements should prove very similar. The suggestion that airships should be used mainly for oversea flying recalls the proposal that they might be designed to alight on water, thereby enabling them to take refuge in any well-sheltered and sufficiently roomy harbour, and avoiding the danger of being absolutely dependent on expensive mooring masts. The idea is not so fantastic as may at first appear, and Commander Burney has already described in some detail a design which has been worked out for an airship of more than double the displacement of R 101 fitted with floats.*

Before making a final survey of the position of this country in regard to the future of airships, it is worth noting what is being done abroad. The United States Navy Board, undaunted by any disasters, are building two ships of 6,000,000 cubic feet capacity, which it is expected will have a gross lift of 200 tons and a cruising range of 7000 miles at fifty knots. One ship will be stationed on the Atlantic and the other on the Pacific coast. If they prove successful, they may be followed by a still larger type having a capacity of 10,000,000 cubic feet.† The design for this great ship is of special interest because it provides for a gas-tight outer cover of dural metal, within which will be a seal of helium gas encircling hydrogen-filled bags. The airship is to have a speed of a hundred miles per hour, an endurance of ten thousand miles and be capable of carrying a paying load of a hundred tons. The idea of a metal-covered airship is by no means visionary. The United States Navy has already carried out successful trials with a small rigid of 202,000 cubic feet capacity with a metal skin one hundredth of an inch thick. This small airship is, of course, purely experimental and capable of lifting little more than its own crew of four, but it has a speed of 60 knots and a cruising range of 600 miles, and may well prove another milestone on the path of progress. Germany has a design for a new large rigid—L.Z. 128, of 5,250,000 cubic feet capacity; but construction has been deferred for modifications to be made in order that helium may be used. Other

* 'The World, the Air, and the Future,' by Commander Sir Dennis-toun Burney, Bart., C.M.G., R.N.

† 'Journal of the United States Naval Institute Proceedings,' August 1930.

foreign countries such as France, Italy, and Japan are, so far, contenting themselves with small non-rigids, chiefly for naval uses.

Finally we come to Britain, left with her solitary airship—R 100; three huge hangars at home, and a fourth in India; and four mooring towers. These were the beginnings of what was to have been a bold attempt to link up the distant parts of the Empire by airship liners. What is to be the policy now? Are we to close down the whole of our airship organisation and leave the United States and Germany to develop that side of aviation; or shall we go forward again steadily and systematically, regarding R 100 as existing purely for experimental purposes, carrying out further research with models and small ships of new designs, until we are ready to build a really full-sized airship? To halt, even for a period of years, means that our technical experts will be dispersed and a hard-won experience wasted. If airships prove to be of practical utility, whether for commercial or for naval purposes, they will be needed by the British Empire more than by any other Power. If, after a lapse of years, we start to try and catch up with developments in other countries, our neglect is likely to lead to new disasters.

An endeavour has been made in this article to show that the disasters which have overtaken airships, and particularly R 101, do not indicate any inherent disabilities, and that there is no logical reason for concluding that these aircraft have no future. But it has also been shown that those which have been built in this country up to date had certain definite defects; defects which can and must be overcome before airships can be regarded as safe and efficient. Then, and then only, will it be possible to gauge their commercial potentialities. As flying craft they are best suited for overseas work. The ship of the air is akin to the ship of the sea, and the United States has wisely left the technical development of airships in the hands of their navy. In this country there is a wealth of expert naval knowledge of airships and their construction, of which no use was made when R 101 was built, and it may be said confidently that the weight of seamanlike experience at the Admiralty would have been such that no naval airship would ever have been

sent forth on such a voyage as R 101 attempted in such a condition as she proved to be. Ultimately commercial airships must, if they are to fly at all, fly on their own merits, for no Government department has ever made a success of commercial transport; but meanwhile the Navy may serve itself and the cause of Imperial communications, if to that Service is restored the development of lighter-than-air craft. In order that these should not burden Naval Estimates already pared to the bone, the Admiralty should be credited with a 'grant in aid' from the civil aviation vote of the Air Estimates, on the same lines as the Royal Air Force vote receives 'a grant in aid' from the Naval Estimates in respect of the Fleet Air Arm.

But the whole matter is of Imperial, and not merely insular, much less departmental, significance. Canada and India, as well as Great Britain, have already taken practical steps to give effect to a policy designed to draw the Empire closer; South Africa and Australia were prepared to play their part when the time came. For the Government of this country to drop the whole business without consulting the Dominions might be construed as indifference to a most important factor in Imperial relations; moreover, such a faint-hearted decision would advertise to the world that we confess ourselves beaten where others are still going forward, and that those gallant pioneers who have done so much to develop British airships have given their lives in vain. Surely this should not be their epitaph.

SOME RECENT BOOKS.

Mr Wister's Roosevelt—'Illusion' and 'The Fourth Seal'—Dr Gore's Gifford Lectures—Publishing and Book-selling—Penn and Erasmus Darwin—The Apostate—Tamburlaine—Blake and Chatterton—Improving on Shakespeare—The Civil Service—The Ladies of Llangollen—Victorian Architecture—Tudor England—Mr Courtneidge's Reminiscences—Two Memoirs—John Freeman.

ANOTHER noble volume has come from the pen of Mr Owen Wister, whose services for the Allied Cause in the Great War should not be forgotten. No American did more than he, by his luminous books, to stir his countrymen to take their part in the colossal struggle against evil and to help to the world-saving victory. There is much more in this 'story of a friendship' than a mere personal study of 'Theodore Roosevelt' (Macmillan); but in these limits of space it is only possible to treat of Mr Wister's impressions, based upon intimate knowledge, of that very great man. There was a buccaneer, one of forceful and adventurous spirit, whose sword was readily drawn, a sharp and pointed blade, to help forward human decency and brotherhood. Just over half a century has passed since these men first met, and until Roosevelt's death the life of each was as an open book to the other. In consequence we secure a living portrait, and a lovable. We are shown the President at home and in the White House, on the hustings and during his walks, living and fighting with zest, until the ultimate weariness came; invariably a vital and potent force for democratic fair-play and the truest practical ideals. So vast an area for government as the United States is bound to have problems of immeasurable complexity, and it is easy for the people of a 'tight little island' to misunderstand, as often we have misunderstood, many of the difficulties of that vast and diverse community. This book helps to a right apprehension of the truths of American political life. It is, of course, often brilliant, with touches of character that point a personality. Roosevelt and his devoted wife are living figures; while occasional visitors to the moving scene,

such as Mr Bryan, are vividly glimpsed. How truly is that superfluent demagogue described in 'his genius for uttering emotional sound'!

It was a good thought to reprint, almost within the octave of Armistice Day, Mr H. M. Tomlinson's brochure, 'Illusion: 1915' (Heinemann), for its gentle irony, spiritual beauty, and the reality of its descriptions. The author, with all the varied wealth of his literary output, has done nothing better. It is a glimpse of the silent heroism and the horror of the War, written with an insight and humour that are supremely sympathetic. Visiting the front, passing by many ruins and the frequent evidence of evil and silly death, he comes to a doctor's dug-out and a cat; and there is brought to face something more of the whys and the wherefores of that terrible business. We must never forget the War, for remembrance of its effects—the strong men sacrificed, the beauty destroyed and lost, the ideals threatened and finally changed are necessary if that ordeal of Bedlam and bestiality, which chiefly was 'made in Germany,' is not to be repeated for the ruin of the world. This little book reminds. It is not written in bitterness, whatever Mr Tomlinson at the time may have felt; but is uplifting, cleansing, beautiful.

Any one who in the spare hours of war-time and military duty in this country sets himself to the formidable task of learning Russian, in case it may come in useful, deserves a good reward. Sir Samuel Hoare did this, and his reward, as shown in his new book 'The Fourth Seal' (Heinemann), was a work that was highly responsible, exceedingly interesting, and not without danger. As Chief of the British Intelligence Mission attached to the Russian General Staff, he had every advantage in watching the events of 1916 and early 1917. It was his duty not only to learn events before others, but also to estimate the force of popular and official feelings. He met Russians of all kinds, from the Emperor downwards. He had to try and get the fruits of good organisation in a country where such organisation did not exist. Almost every government department had its own intelligence service, working without any relation to others. There was no co-ordination, no unified system, and no efficiency. Catastrophe was certain. Could the Tsar have stopped it if he had been other than he was? Could he

have cleansed away the vicious corruption in high circles? These questions, with many others, must remain unanswered. Sir Samuel gives vivid pictures of many eminent Russians, and tells us what they did, and what they failed to do. He ends with a charming biographical sketch of the Grand Duchess Elizabeth, saint and martyr, whose wonderful goodness was so far beyond the comprehension of the revolutionaries that they murdered her. This is an interesting book, and the author knows how to carry his readers with him from the first page to the last.

Bishop Gore is a great spiritual asset to these days of faith and unfaith, and of a generally sincere wish to discover the truths especially of religious things. The purity of his life and his wide, though ever-alert scholarship, have combined to give an authority of inestimable value to his words spoken and printed. This new volume of his Gifford Lectures, *'The Philosophy of the Good Life'* (Murray), carries to a stage further the studies brought together in his recent work—great in substance as in helpful truth—on *'The Reconstruction of Belief.'* In these lectures he examines frankly the principles expressed in the teachings of Zarathustra, the Buddha, Confucius, and others who did not go so far as to claim that they were divine or the prophets of Divinity; with Israel, Mohammed, Plato, and his inquiring fellow Greeks. In the end Dr Gore shows how the gospel of Christ and the truths derived from it are 'the most rational of all the intellectual interpretations of the world.' He has had regard not only to the teachings of other religions or pagan philosophies, but also to the new psychology and the old rationalism; and brings out the saving fact of Christianity that it came into the world, not as a new theological system, but as a way of life to be lived. Here is a work to be commended—especially to those in the ministry. It clears away difficulties, and it establishes truth.

In the preface to his full and absorbing history of *'Publishing and Bookselling'* (Cape), Mr Frank A. Mumby salutes those 'merchant-adventurers'—how far better that than 'Barabbas!'—with whom he has been associated for the last thirty years. Every one of the publishers and booksellers met by him in that period will return the salute; and at the same time thank him for the very real help he has given to the Trade, as

well as for this volume, which, beginning with the baked clay tablets of Mesopotamia, comes to the present day with its spate of books pouring from the presses to be absorbed by a world that often has earthquakes in consequence of literary indigestion. This is a full book, bringing into its scope every aspect and detail, as it seems, of the varied history of the Trade—the Grub Street of Defoe's and Johnson's days, the Scott bankruptcy, the first circulating library—but it is useless to endeavour to suggest the bountiful provision of this work. Even the Times Book-War is not overlooked; it is tactfully, sufficiently referred to.

When virtues, in themselves praiseworthy, clash and cause nothing but trouble, do they (and, if so, at what point) become vices? This perennial problem might be taken as the key-note of 'The Making of William Penn' by M. R. Brailsford (Longmans). On the one side was Sir William Penn, the father (in trying to belittle whom incidentally, Pepys belittled himself)—an upright, God-fearing sailor and official in a corrupt age. He strongly, and rightly, held to the traditions and feelings of his class and family. On the other side was William, the son, the founder of Pennsylvania, a fine character with all the instincts of an English gentleman, yet compelled by his conscience not only to risk his worldly advantages, but to go out of his way to hurt these whom he loved and who loved him. President Roosevelt once said that, though of course it is laudable and right for a man to follow the dictates of his conscience, if that conscience makes a fool of him all the time it is wise to take it out and examine it and see if it is working properly! The Admiral was extraordinarily long-suffering with the Quaker vagaries of his son, and indeed was in sympathy with many of the Quaker ideals; but when it came to their eccentricities of speech and dress and at times unnecessary discourtesy, he could endure it no longer, and turned his son out of the house. Luckily, the exclusion was only temporary, and complete reconciliation was effected before his death. The present volume, except for a final summarising chapter, covers William Penn's earlier years to the time when he left for America—a well-told story of a fine and determined man, but in their clash of ideals our sympathies are with the father.

It must be that the greatness of the grandson of 'Doctor Darwin' (Dent) overshadowed the grandfather, for there is no other reasonable explanation of the moderate place occupied by Erasmus Darwin in the general memory and appreciation. He was a remarkable man; a pioneer in many branches of science, a practical and most humane philosopher, a writer of verse which secured for him prominence among the poets of his time, the friend of famous people, and a pet aversion of Dr Johnson. He was also a wit with a tang to his tongue, and a man of humour; in brief, an exceptional citizen. It is, therefore, full time for an adequate biography of him to come, and here it is from the pen of his descendant, Mr Hesketh Pearson, who has, however, spent too many pages over some of the doctor's friends. Interesting, but not truly germane to this issue. Not for the first time among the great ones of the earth we find that it is their humanity that appeals rather than their cleverness, and Mr Pearson has rightly taken care to bring out the warmth and wit of the great doctor. That he was apt to be crotchety is shown by the way he failed to get along well with his sons; but such is often the way with supermen who sometimes prove not the best fathers. Possibly they expect too much of their offspring, or their offspring does of them. It is certain, however, that the even greater grandson inherited something of the best of the doctor's mind and personality, for amid his pioneer efforts in medicine and social reform—and Erasmus was humane over the prisons, asylums, and the slave-trade—he also had such imagination in science as foresaw more than a glimmer of the truths of natural selection and evolution which were to be the gift to knowledge of Charles Darwin. Erasmus recognised that the whole of life is 'one family of one parent,' and was able to point the moral in his verse:

'Stoop, selfish Pride! Survey thy kindred forms,
Thy brother Emmets, and thy sister Worms.'

Dr Douglas Simpson's molograph on 'Julian the Apostate' (Milne and Hutchinson, Aberdeen) is possibly a little too self-consciously well-written; but that it is its only fault, if fault it be, being really but an excess of care. He has made the great hero and idealist live, and shows Julian in so sympathetic a light that the reader

is easily persuaded to shout with him and Gibbon, and to hold in contempt the degenerate Christians and 'that miserable whelk Jovian,' Julian's successor, who had brought down their religion and the Roman Empire to a condition of decay. The moral greatness of the Apostate is brought out indirectly by his weaknesses as well as by his strength; for, after all, he was the child of his times and the fact that in many things, as in his persecutions, he could not altogether rise above those times brings to him greater credit for the many noble respects in which he did rise superior to the rest of his generation. He was, as an Essayist has finely said, 'the last figure standing on the shore of the ancient world,' picturesque and poetic of vision and thought.

In our preceding number, and at some length, the personality and literary characteristics of Christopher Marlowe were considered, and we were able to give a hearty blessing to the first volume, 'begot' by Professor Tucker Brooke, of the Works and Life of the Poet, of which the second volume, reprinting and estimating '**Tamburlaine the Great**' (Methuen), has since come to us. Except for the doubtful experiment of modernising the text of the plays, a process surely needless and detracting from the interest of the printed pages—the work is most commendable. The editor of this double play, in which in some respects Marlowe touched the height of his greatness, Miss U. M. Ellis-Fermor has taken inestimable pains to secure the purity of the text and to discover the meanings of doubtful and disputable passages. In the end of her critical examination she boldly advances Marlowe's right to a more exalted place in the congress of English poets than has yet been given to him; going so far, but not too far, as to claim for his precision in scholarship, remembering the limitations of his time and his wide imaginative scope, an ascendancy equalled and excelled among poets by Milton alone. It truly is high time that Marlowe had his due, and this full, rich six-volume edition of his works provides the opportunity. It is indispensable to serious libraries.

The spiritual courage and beauty, as it was, of the ideals of Blake—in respect to which, after years of neglect, he is rapidly coming to his own—receive further clarifying through Miss Emily S. Hamblen's deep study

'On the Minor Prophecies of William Blake'; a bulky addition to the series which Messrs Dent, with enterprise and fine taste in the production, are bringing out. Doubtless, much of Blake's philosophy will never be elucidated—he could not do it himself if set to the task!—for the applications, through lapse of time, are so vague, and it was written with an impulse and inspiration—as though with a quill from the wing of an archangel—too far removed from the measures of this mortal earth. But yet the prophetic writings, with the poems and the engraved wisdom, are being eagerly studied and slowly the exalted and complicate thought of the poet-artist-seer is growing clearer. This volume helps the process assuredly, and makes its mark near the beginning with the assertion, startling, tumbling the theories of the earlier authorities, yet almost certainly true, that Catherine Blake, who has been lauded as the ideal wife for her husband (and nothing can diminish the affection one feels for the poor woman herself) was nothing of the kind. This new theory explains, amongst other things, the difficult scene of the supposed rudeness to Robert Blake, the adored brother, with its sequel; from the humiliation of which Mrs Blake was saved by her own simple courage. The author would have increased the usefulness to Blakeites of her book had she been a little more direct and kept out such far-fetched theories as that of the signs of the Zodiac and figures being derived from the palm of the hand and not from the designs star-built in the sky. Nevertheless, it is a big-minded work, and helpful.

Mr E. H. W. Meyerstein, in the modesty of its dedication, calls his portentous '**Life of Thomas Chatterton**' (Ingpen and Grant) an 'imperfect essay.' Which shows the inappropriateness or the humour of some verbal expressions, for assuredly no biography of a person of less than eighteen years of age has had such a mountainous mass of details and conjectures gathered as is here. This book, anyhow, cannot be superseded, for not much can be left to be told. Moreover, it is truthful; though, rightly, its bias is with the poet who perished in his pride. What a wretched and pathetic story it reveals of ambitions despoiled, of illusions cultivated only to become fatal! The agony of those ultimate months in London; of the

struggle and starvation while Chatterton pretended to be gloriously successful, until the hoarded arsenic brought the end, are almost beyond adequate description by mere powers of prose. Mr Meyerstein has achieved his aim. He explains how Chatterton came to represent the monkish Rowley—it was a personal adoption of a very peculiar kind—and how he came to his untimely death. Untimely it was, for although this poet probably would not have risen to the heights of this author's faith in him, he had, without question, some of the stuff of dreams and gifts of lucid and emotional expression.

Why cannot Shakespeare be left alone? Why must his Plays and Poems be for ever ransacked merely to destroy the possibility of his having written them? The old Baconianism happily is dead; but further bogeys are being set up as the probable only begetters of his works. Mr H. T. S. Forrest is ingenious and honest, making inquiry in a fair and thoughtful spirit; but the question raised in his examination of 'The Original "Venus and Adonis"' (Lane) is not one, we think, worth submitting to the jury of Shakespearian experts that he invites. His theory is that the less pleasing, the more artificial, the less perfect stanzas of 'Venus and Adonis' were interpolated by one or more other versifiers, and he prints the poem with those stanzas omitted, and of course makes of it a more finished work. But Shakespeare, even in his greatest plays, had imperfections. He had just such occasional flaws, artificialities, and precocities as Mr Forrest detects, and the tone of the discarded stanzas is fully consonant with Shakespeare's mental and emotional atmosphere. The ultimate suggestion that possibly Southampton was the 'Interpolator' is more airy than ever.

Many of us realise that there are hundreds of thousands of human officials 'on the strength' of the Civil Service, but few know that there are also such things as official eels with their daily pay (of worms) for keeping the tanks of the National Physical Laboratory free from noxious insects. This is one of the curious details given in 'The Romance of the Civil Service' by Samuel MacKechnie (Marston Low). Not only does the author give us a valuable summary of the highways of the Civil Service, such as the Treasury, the Foreign, Colonial, Dominion,

Home, India, and other big Government offices, but he also introduces us to many quaint by-ways showing the huge ramifications of the Service in unexpected quarters. Even the Inland Revenue, tax collecting and probate officials are shown to be human, with natural feelings and sympathies—outside their offices! Many people seem to think of the Civil Service merely as a vast machine of heartless impersonality. This book shows that it is a living organisation, which even enjoys the lighter moments of sport and art, besides being well represented in literature. It also, in the National Stud, breeds victorious racehorses, and it looks now as if it is going officially to breed totalisators! That seems a far cry from the Foreign Office and Somerset House; but all goes to show the variety and many branches of a wonderful and loyal Service.

The inappeasable interest that for over a hundred years has been taken in the Ladies of Llangollen will receive an impetus through the discovery in a Sheraton cabinet of the letters and diaries amply quoted from in '**The Hamwood Papers**' (Macmillan), edited by Mrs G. H. Bell, who evidently found it a labour of joy. That extraordinary friendship between Lady Eleanor Butler and Miss Sarah Ponsonby, which began when they were romantic girls—certainly romantic, as is proved by the story here told of their attempted and successful flights together—and lasted until they were charming old women, has touched the popular imagination, and this volume shows why that is so. Their privacy was intimate, yet splendidly public. Their little cottage in the village of Llangollen was on a high-road so that great men, travelling from Ireland or Wales to London, could and did pause on their ways to visit them; and so constant were the ladies to each other that for the long span of fifty years, although they also paid their many visits, they slept every night, without exception, under their own roof. But not only the ladies in this book delight and interest. The background of the letters and diaries is filled with the sights and doings of eighteenth-century England. We see the villagers, whom at the end we seem individually to know, gathering in their harvests; the Clerk with his hay-cart on scarlet wheels, the Dentist who recommended the use of that new thing, a toothbrush.

Also there was the beloved hen, an historic bird, whose tragic and violent death the ladies never ceased to lament. Their conversations, often noted down, touched infinite subjects, sacred and profane; while their likes and misgivings, and the pained confessions of their frequent 'hardupedness,' were pointedly expressed. A very human glimpse of unforgettable people.

The alleged self-complacency of the Victorians, and the century they helped to establish as great, would receive frequent jars if the criticism to which they are subject were fully justified. Happily, and possibly in part because of that alleged self-complacency, they are able to rebut effectively the accusations of inferiority and of conscious superiority brought against them; but still, youth being ever militantly youthful, the criticisms continue. In '**Amphion**' (Dent) Mr Dudley Harbron, verbally and with illustrative drawings, examines the architecture realised during the nineteenth century and, being an architect with an informed and witty pen, is able to make good play from its ambitions and generally bathetic results. The Albert Memorial has had so many stones hurled at its gilded pretentiousness that the wonder is its substance has not gone. He has not overlooked that misadventure of Gilbert Scott, or the Law Courts, or the Crystal Palace, or many things else, believed at the time to be grand which familiarity has made commonplace, or it may be even contemptible. Yet there was architectural good also in the age. Out of the dismalness which the growth of Industrialism caused, a false prettiness with floral fripperies, and, after a while, the 'standardisation of the atrocious,' were bound to come, with Pugin as the sublime architect of a debased universe; but excellent work also was evolved at Liverpool and elsewhere, and the author's judgment of the age in its builded aspects, is not all condemnation. Even the Victorian is entitled to his due.

In her careful study of '**The Decline of Merry England**' (Cassell), Miss Storm Jameson has not sufficiently cleared the ground for her argument by showing that England ever was merry and, therefore, in such a respect had declined. We are given glimpses of the Tudor day when joy is supposed to have irradiated the life of our island, and find there so much poverty, hunger, foulness, and need of sanitation, with their con-

sequences, the plague, beggary, and violent robbery, with savage processes of imprisonment and execution, that we cannot accept her conclusion that it was 'a happier England than ever before or since.' But beside such doubtful assumption as that on which her edifice of argument is reared, her examples, quoted from the lips of contemporary witnesses, are too confused together to leave a convincing impression, especially as she frequently leaves it to the reader to grope among the notes at the back of the book for the name of the person quoted, a process the more confused because the pages do not bear the chapter-number as such a system demands. Much of the book is good, and the case that the dark spirit of Puritanism has been the destructive agency which only a truer spirituality can counteract, is probably true; but Miss Storm Jameson has not made the most of it.

The glimpses we enjoy of '**Tudor England through Venetian Eyes**' (Williams and Norgate), thanks to the patient offices of Dr Emma Gurney Salter, are not nearly so full, inspiring, or satisfying as those gained through the Fugger Letters; but they serve. The author has rather described the opportunities given through the translations of the reports of the Ambassadors of Venice made to the Doge in office than allowed us to see for ourselves the sights of Tudor England as revealed to those interested observers. Yet because those times were so picturesque, and the series of monarchs from Henry the Eighth to Elizabeth make such varied human appeal, we are truly thankful. It will be news to many that the Flanders galleys then had a loadline over which the authorities were strict, and there is a vivid description of the shrine of Becket, with its great burning ruby transformed by bluff Hal into a ring for his own royal hand. Of him in his young manliness there is a notable picture—and the pity of it is that he should have deteriorated so rapidly along the ways of tainted flesh. We have glimpses of the bold eyes of Anne Boleyn, of the slim grace of Elizabeth's Essex, of Calais in its siege and fall; and of the Englishmen of the time with much such faults and qualities—praise the gods!—as still are their characteristics.

There is more in Robert Courtneidge's '**I Was an Actor Once**' (Hutchinson) than is usual in a work of

theatrical reminiscences, which so often are compilations of mere egoism, tired anecdotes, and the fulsome flattery of provincial press-cuttings. This biography is otherwise. Its author has more to say than gossip brings, and he says it excellent-well. Beside the story of his hard-working life, he gives good advice to those who are thinking of the stage as a profession, as well as to those who already adorn, or, at any rate, get their living by it. His counsel—and he doesn't say Don't to the aspirants—comes from a warm heart as well as a shrewd head, and shows that he loves and is proud of his art and craft. The most interesting chapters are those describing his early struggles when it was a case of long hours and many parts for a few shillings^a a week, with intervals of half-starvation between the engagements. The heroine of the book is his mother; from whom assuredly Mr Courtneidge inherited much of his fine character, though not all. Here is an attractive volume written by a man of heart and wisdom.

The assertion that every life would make a book of some interest gains an example in the '**Memoirs of a Ceylon Planter**' (Rivingtons), which Captain Mount-steven Bremer has published. It is not a brilliant narrative, many of the incidents are ordinary, and several of the stories hardly attain their point; but it makes pleasant reading for a few spare hours because of the attractive personality of the memoirist. Captain Bremer was sixty-four years of age when at the outbreak of the War, after a brief spell as a special constable, he joined the Armoured Car Service of the R.N.A.S. and was very active in Belgium and France. Then began seven years of varied war-work, generally out of England; a fine record for a young-hearted veteran. Before that he had travelled and worked and seen something of the Franco-Prussian War and of many parts of the world. We are glad to give tribute to so sterling a British citizen who still might be serving the State had it not been for the despair that came over him—and many another—when Southern Ireland took the name of a Free State.

Mr Thomas Okey is a remarkable man, whose character and achievements prove that fineness of soul and purposes has not deserted this country in these days—as doubtless generations to come will recognise. His brief

autobiography, '**A Basketful of Memories**' (Dent), tells an honourable story of the manual worker in the Spitalfields slum who, through grit, gumption, and intelligence of heart as well as of mind, taught himself the humanities and made himself an expert of languages so that he became a Professor and Fellow of Cambridge. A fine record, especially as in working for his own spiritual and intellectual liberation Mr Okey remembered others and fought in many lost causes which have somehow come to victory since. The best parts of his book are the early and the concluding pages, which describe life in poverty seventy years ago, and show how wonderfully since those not far distant days the world has improved in practical kindness and the wisdom of the heart. Then, as he illustrates from the 'Times' newspaper of the sixties, death from starvation was frequent. How happily different is it now ! Fitly from the same publishing house also has come a copy of 'the fourth edition of Mr Okey's '**Venice and its Story**,' revised, admirably illustrated, and describing not merely the amazing history of the unique city, but its present walks and ways.

Mr J. C. Squire has paid a right and charming tribute to John Freeman in the Introduction to the '**Last Poems**' (Macmillan) of one whose work and personality deserved recognition. The wonder about Freeman is that behind that quiet and, as it seemed, shy demeanour, there worked the brain and energy of an effective business man ; for he was a power in the world of Insurance. But the truest part of him found expression in his poetry, which is warm with sympathy for the loveliest things in life. His verse rarely sings, but it is richly expressive of beauty in nature, and he could see the divine in many of the simplicities. As Mr Squire points out, some of the poems in this volume needed the final touches ; but as it is, it will remain a characteristic memorial to a man of cultured mind and good heart.

.
.
.
.
e
e
r
l
.
e
r
e
s
l
e
.
.
d
d
d
r
e
h
e.
y
e
e
t
of